

THE  
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1882.

---

ART. I.—THE ALLEGORICAL POETRY OF ENGLAND.

BY PROF. WM. M. NEVIN, ESQR., LL.D.

AN allegorical poem is one which seeks to convey instruction without assuming a purely didactic form. It may be, to all external appearance, a metrical romance, treating merely of the marvelous conquests of chivalrous knights, achieved by main strength and prowess, over some desperate, superhuman, malignant foes, and yet be containing under it a still deeper moral significance. Of the Romance languages of modern Europe that of Provence, in southern France, was the first to be cultivated on the Revival of Letters, and the troubadours were its earliest singers. The poetry of the Arabians was their only model, from which they derived their rhyme and metre; while their harps, like that of Anacreon, sounded only love. The Arabians, however, besides their other songs, had their allegorical pieces, and these the troubadours of southern France sought also sometimes to imitate; but while, of the Arabians, those of this kind, besides of love, often treated of higher scientific subjects, to which they were devoted, those of the

troubadours still remained amatory. Their harps, or light guitars, even in their allegorical pieces, sounded only love; and in these their whole object was not to impart any instruction, but merely, through the presentation of beautiful images, to convey pleasure and amusement to their gay and idle listeners.

The Love personified by them in their allegorical poems was not the Eros of the ancient Greeks nor the Cupid of the ancient Romans, but one of later times derived from the Arabians. He is represented as a young cavalier clothed in the costume of the chivalrous age which gave him birth; his figure slight and graceful, his robe embroidered with flowers, his head adorned with a crown of roses, and his palfrey white as snow, the saddle-bow of jasper, the housings of sapphire, and the stirrups of chalcedony. His suite was composed, not of joys and smiles, but of the chivalric virtues, derived from the East, such as Mercy, Loyalty, and Modesty, whose duty it is to speak and not to act.

Of poetry, which is reckoned of the highest kind, is that which expresses action, and, as the dramatic and epical are eminently of such, they are considered as being of a higher type than is the lyrical, whose prevailing element is the emotional. The Trouveres of northern France or Normandy, who succeeded in time the southern Troubadours, were of a spirit quite different from these. To suit the genius of their more northern people, who were partly derived from Norway, and were distinguished for their bravery, their bold, adventurous, and valorous achievements in war and knight-errantry, their poetry was no longer lyrical but epical or narrative in its tone. The tales of these, if written for the rich, were astir with action which gave pleasure to all lively minds, and they could be recited by the people at their merry-makings. The love-singing of the troubadours had no such currency. It was a part of the idleness of the idle. Of the tales of the trouveres the heroes at first were by no means mere fictitious or allegorical personages, but such as had really flourished and distinguished themselves by

the performance of marvelous military feats, though now greatly exaggerated and improved by imagination, in the glorious olden times of romantic chivalry which had long preceded their own, as, for instance, the adventurous knights of King Arthur's "Round Table," or the stalwart Paladins of the Court of Charlemagne.

This, however, did not long remain the case. Soon, alongside of these, sprang up poems of quite a different description, and finally supplanted them. The natural taste of the northern French to give preference to wit and argument, and to set before them in their writing some definite moral object to be had closely in view to the end, soon asserted its rights; and, as being better adapted for the observance of this, they continued to make use of the epical style of poetry in preference to the lyric. And still more to conform to their national taste, though the inventors of the rich and brilliant romances of chivalry, we find them, nevertheless, at the same period producing, as Sismondi is pleased to call them, those tedious allegorical poems which were subsequently imitated by all the Romance nations of Europe.

The most celebrated, and perhaps the most ancient, of these is the "Romance of the Rose," which, indeed, was commenced to be written by a troubadour of Toulouse, but completed, and highly improved and moralized afterwards, by a trouvère of Normandy. In this all human virtues and vices are personified and brought upon the scene. One allegory is linked to another, and the imagination wanders amongst these fictitious beings, upon whom it is impossible to bestow any corporeal attributes. This fatiguing method is necessarily destructive of all interest. "We are far more willing," says M. Sismondi, "to bestow our attention upon a poem which relates to human feelings and actions, however insignificant they may be, than upon one which is full of abstract sentiments and ideas, represented under the names of men and women. At the period, however, when the Romance of the Rose first appeared, the less it interested the

reader as a narrative the more it was admired as a work of intellect, as a fine moral conception, and as philosophy clothed in the garb of poetry. Brilliant passages struck the eye at every line; the object of the author was never out of sight; and, since poetry was regarded by the northern French as the vehicle of agreeable instruction, they must necessarily have been of opinion that the Romance of the Rose was admirably calculated for attaining this end, as it contained a rich mine of pleasing information."

After the Norman Conquest the literature in England, for several centuries, was the same as that of the Normans, who had transferred it into the country, and it was expressed, if not in Latin, in their own French language; and when, in the course of time, the Anglo-Saxon tongue, commingling with this, had become modern English, the prevailing poetry uttered through it for a long while continued to be epical or narrative, and to treat generally of subjects similar or corresponding to those of the French.

When Chaucer commenced writing in England, metrical romances had been overdone, and were becoming distasteful to the people from their superabundance, but allegorical poetry was still in great demand. His earliest poems, therefore, are generally of this latter description, and it is not until he has become familiarly acquainted with some of the Italian poets and sojourned in their land that he grows more inclined to give descriptions of real life and manners as actually existing and to be met with around him, which he carries to the highest perfection in his *Canterbury Tales*.

"Chaucer," says M. Taine, "sets out as if to quit the middle age, but in the end he is there still. To-day he composes the *Canterbury Tales*; yesterday he was translating the *Roman de la Rose*. To-day he is studying the complicated machinery of the heart, discovering the issues of primitive education or the ruling disposition, and realizing the comedy of manners; tomorrow he will have no pleasure but in curious events, smooth



allegories, amorous discussions imitated from the French, or learned moralities from the ancients. Alternately he is an observer and a *trouvere*; instead of the step he ought to have advanced, he has but made a half-step."

But although allegorical poetry came over into England first from France, yet the English people, even on the Saxon side, were very kindly disposed to receive it. Indeed such poetry falls in more readily with the genius and taste of a northern people than with those of a southern. As we have seen, it was not in Southern France but in Normandy that it was first highly cultivated, and after having been brought into England and fondly cherished there, it was carried to a still more extravagant excess in the Lowlands of Scotland, situate in a more northern clime, as can be observed, for instance, in the poems of Dunbar and Lindsay. A southern people are generally more remarkable for the vivacity and intensity of their passions and emotions, which are best expressed through lyrical verse; while in a northern people the imagination and the moral sentiments are more highly developed, and find a more suitable expression through narrative or epic poetry. Add to this, that the northern nations of Europe, with the exception of the Irish, the Welsh, and the Scottish Highlanders, are mostly of the Teutonic race, and are therefore by nature, as it is allowed, more moral and intellectual, though, no doubt, less æsthetical in their tastes and feelings, than are the Southern Romance nations, which belong, with some little relic of the Celtic and a slight infusion of the Teutonic, to the Latin race.

No wonder, then, that the English poets were disposed to introduce allegory into their poems, inasmuch as this would conduce very much to their moral tone, while still retaining their epical or narrative structure. Like as, around the thyrsus of Bacchus the pleasant vine and ivy leaves were made to twine and thus conceal its point, so beneath the external form and comeliness of their poems a moral meaning or purpose, often satirical, was thus made allegorically to lurk, which, had it been openly expressed, devoid of all ornament, in purely didactic

style, would have shorn them of their highest beauty and reduced them to a lower grade of verse.

In the "Vision of Piers the Ploughman," though an allegorical poem, the pilgrims who set out in search of Truth are no less really and prominently shown from life than are those represented in the "Canterbury Tales," slowly wending their way towards the shrine of Thomas a Becket, which are not allegorical, affording us thus two contrasted pictures vividly expressed, and characteristic of the existing times, the one as observed by the genial Chaucer from his courtly stand-point, and the other as observed by the gloomy Langland, the truthful satirist, and poet of the poor.

By a few poets contemporary with Chaucer, and by many after him, was the allegorical style of writing adopted, but by none carried to greater completeness than it was by Spenser in the Elizabethan era. Before composing the "Fairy Queen," Spenser, though a true Englishman of the Saxon lineage and mood, had come very much under the influence of the Italian poets; and the works of Ariosto and Tasso, which were very much talked of and famous at that time, he assumed as his models; but while the idea and framework of the "Fairy Queen" was taken from them, and, like theirs, the machinery was borrowed from the days, or rather the literature, of chivalry, and similar to theirs was the stanza adopted by him, but lengthened and improved; yet, unlike them, Spenser avowedly designed to himself a moral purpose and meaning in his poem. He therefore made it allegorical. It was not merely a brilliant and entertaining series of adventures, like the *Orlando*; it was not merely a poetical celebration of a great historical legend, a religious epic, like the *Gerusalemme*. It professed to be a veiled exposition of moral philosophy. It was planned and all its imaginative wealth unfolded in order to portray and recommend the virtues, and to exhibit philosophical speculations. Had it not been of such a character it would not have fallen in fully nor complied with the taste of the English, being not only a northern people but also of the Teutonic race.

The poet Campbell, after having made other eulogistic remarks concerning Spenser's treatment of the "Fairy Queen," goes on to say:—"The clouds of his allegory may seem to spread into shapeless forms, but they are still the clouds of a glowing atmosphere. Though his story grows desultory, the sweetness and grace of his manner still abide with him. He is like a speaker whose tones continue to be pleasing, though he may speak too long; or like a painter who makes us forget the defect of his design by the magic of his coloring. We always rise from perusing him with melody in the mind's ear, and with pictures of romantic beauty impressed on the imagination." But then reversely he remarks:—"There is one peculiarity in the Fairy Queen, which, though not a deeply pervading defect, I cannot help considering as an incidental blemish; namely, that the allegory is doubled and crossed with complimentary allusions to living or recent personages, and that the agents are partly historical and partly allegorical. In some instances the characters have a threefold allusion. Gloriana is at once an emblem of true glory, an empress of Fairy Land, and her Majesty Queen Elizabeth. Envy is a personified passion, and also a witch, and with no very charitable insinuation, a type of the unfortunate Mary Queen of Scots. The Knight in dangerous distress is Henry IV. of France; and the Knight of Magnificence Prince Arthur, the son of Uther Pendragon, an ancient British hero, is the bulwark of the Protestant cause in the Netherlands. Such distraction of allegory cannot well be said to make a fair experiment of its power. The poet may cover his moral meaning under a single and transparent veil of fiction; but he has no right to muffle it up in foldings which hide the form and symmetry of truth."

Of the literature of the Elizabethan era Spenser and Shakespeare are the two great representatives, the one of the narrative and the other of the dramatic order. Before their time the narrative had been the one prevailing sort of poetry, being mostly well commingled with allegory. Even the Miracle plays

of mediæval invention and fame, to conform to the popular taste, in the middle of the fifteenth century, were made to give way to the Moralities; the subjects of which, instead of being taken from the Bible, or the legends of the saints, as had been those of the Miracle plays, were now simply moral, as their name implies; and their ethical lessons were imparted by an action and a *dramatis personæ* of an abstract or allegorical kind.

This allegorical tendency, however, as well as the attempt of some to conform their dramas to the stricter classical mode of the ancients, was over-ruled by the introduction and lasting establishment, through the superior genius of Shakespeare, of the Romantic drama, being in closer conformity to the freer spirit of modern times, and especially of the Elizabethan era, of which it became the prevailing literature. And, as Shakespeare well remarks that the proper purpose of playing is, "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure," this has always been best accomplished by the introduction on the stage, not of any abstract attributes of the human mind personified, but of real, substantial personages, truly characteristic of human nature and their own or other times.

The Fairy Queen, however, after the rise of the Romantic drama, which, in its first publication, it had partially preceded, lost nothing of the high estimation in which it was held. As the first great ideal poem which England had produced, it had taken the world by surprise, and ever afterwards it continued to exert its influence on the greatest English poets. By the followers of Spenser, indeed, in the next generation allegoricalness was often carried to an extravagant and ridiculous excess: as, for instance, by Phineas Fletcher, who, in his "Purple Island," as Campbell well remarks, "through its first five cantos tries to sweeten the language of anatomy by the flowers of poetry, and to support the wings of allegory by bodily instead

of spiritual phenomena. Unfortunately in the remaining cantos he only quits the dissecting table to launch into the subtilty of the schools, and describes Intellect, the Prince of the Isle of Man, with his eight counsellors, Fancy, Memory, the Common Sense, and the five External Senses, as holding out against the Evil powers that besiege it."

After these, however, it remained for the superior genius of Milton to create an epic poem of the highest conception, whose moral beauty and grandeur, with little or no use of allegory, is derived from the sublime character of the subject he has chosen as well as from his inspired, impassioned manner of treating it. In which respect, though a Puritan himself, he was still retaining his ardent love for classic and romantic art, not eschewing, like other Puritans of his day, all literature, except such as was moral and not æsthetical and immediately derived from the Bible; whose spiritual truths, indeed, as exhibited in that Holy Book itself, are often delivered to us through parables or allegories or correspondencies taken from, and to be seen, in outward nature; the only way in which they possibly could be communicated to our earthly limited understandings.

"The Bible was Bunyan's only book, and the source from whence he derived all his language and inspiration. He had lived among the visions and voices of Heaven till all sense of possible unreality had died away. He tells his tale, in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, with such perfect naturalness that allegories become living things, that the Slough of Despond and Doubting Castle are as real to us as places which we see every day, that we know Mr. Legality and Mr. Worldly Wiseman as if we had met them on the street. It is in the amazing reality of impersonification that Bunyan's imaginative genius specially displays itself. Shakespeare, as it has been well remarked, is not more essentially the prince of dramatists than is Bunyan the prince of allegorists."—*Campbell*.

After the Restoration in England no great allegorical poem is to be met with, for a long while, in her literature. The

poets have become obtrusively and unreservedly didactic. To make poetical their moral sentiments and philosophical opinions, or their denouncements of the glaring vices and follies of their times, all that was required of them was to express these in exact metre and consonant rhymes. Allegory has gone out of use, except perhaps in apologues and some short pastoral poems. The romantic stanza of Chaucer, improved upon and rendered more Gothic by Spenser, has been discarded, and all epical, descriptive, and didactic poetry are now made to be conformed to the narrow constrictions of the heroic couplet; limed, at length, to the highest polish and refinement by the unromantic, but highly artistic genius of Pope; so admirably adapted for the better expressing of trite apothegms and wise proverbial sayings.

In the great revolution of taste which took place at the close of the eighteenth century, with a dismissal of the artificial style of poetry, which had held its own during the long classic period, and a return to nature, and at the same time by some to the romantic style, there was no immediate resumption along with these of allegorical verse. When Scott went back in imagination to the mediæval times it was not from the *Roman de la Rose* or *The Flower and the Leaf* of Chaucer, those allegorical poems, that he caught his flowing rhythm and spirit and fervor, but from the metrical romances, which even in Chaucer's time were falling into disuse; and in the Romantic poems of Scott, as well as in those old romances which he followed, there is no moral pabulum contained for our spiritual nourishment, except so much as may be received by us from the reading of the chivalrous and gallant accomplishments of their valiant heroes.

Wordsworth, on the other hand, delights to hold close communion with nature in her solitary beauty and grandeur, to be loved and apprehended by him in the prospects to be seen everywhere around him, without any very great regard for mediæval legends or classic mythology. "To console the afflicted; to add sunshine to daylight by making the happy

happier; to teach the young and the gracious of every age to see, to think, and feel, and therefore to become more actively and securely virtuous,"—this is his own account of the purpose of his poetry, and this he accomplishes by making it always of the approved style of the day, calling in no aid from allegory on the one hand, and on the other, never rendering it, except in some few instances, openly and obtrusively didactic.

Byron, indeed, is often a moralizer, but he is not a moral poet. In his first fierce iambics he makes a swinging onslaught on the "English Bards and Scottish Reviewers," and indulges besides afterwards in morose and acrimonious feelings towards the whole English people, by whom he fancies, in their rigid code of morals, he has been adjudged too severely. In his *Childe Harold*, while assuming the Spenserian stanza he does not assume, at the same time, the Spenserian mode of conveying moral instruction, allegorically expressed through the ultimate conquests of the impersonated virtues over the impersonated vices; but pursuing the natural bent of his genius, in his voyaging and pilgrimages abroad in southern lands, he finds a consonant opportunity for soothing his troubled spirit by sympathizing with the oppressed, or in moralizing on the world's past greatness, attaining his highest lyrical inspiration in his apostrophe to Rome; or in the consolation he receives from viewing nature in her grandest aspects, amid the solitudes of sea and lake and mountain.

Corresponding to the prevailing disposition preceding the French Revolution, among the masses, to throw off all political and religious restraint, was that felt also by the poets of England, at the same time, to free themselves from their literary servitude. It was an age of passion and excitement, and these could no longer be made to conform their verses to the rigid rules and requirements of the classic period. To the artificial, mechanical, didactic school, which Pope's successors had made intolerable, was now opposed a counter theory of the poetic function, which Arnold is pleased to call the theory of



the spontaneous. Whatever of great value comes from the poet, it was maintained, is not that which he wills to say, but that which he cannot help saying; that which some higher power—call it nature or what you will—dictates through his lips as through an oracle.

This theory accorded well with the genius of some of the greatest poets who flourished in the Georgian period; but while it drove away from Helicon many versifiers who had no business there, such as Akenside, Young, and Thomson, it gave encouragement to others, equally undeserving, fancying they were filled with the divine afflatus, to thrust on the credulous public their crude effusions, "rugged and unkempt," without having received from them any retrenching or after amendment.

In contradistinction to this arose the Idyllic school, of which Tennyson is the proper representative; for though in every other kind of poetry that he has essayed he has mostly succeeded, yet it is in idyllic poetry that he is most at home, and in which most of his best work has been done. This maintains that even the best poems, though having first evolved from the highest inspiration, have need to be submitted afterwards to a refining process, that the *limæ labor et mora* be severely applied, till all their superfluities have been removed and they have been brought to the finest polish.

The difference between the two schools, the Spontaneous and the Idyllic, is best shown in the difference which Mr. Stedman observes as existing between Byron and Tennyson. "Byron with all the glow of genius," he remarks, "constantly giving utterance to condensed and powerful expressions, never attempted condensation in his general style; there was nothing he so little cared for, his inspiration must have full flow and break through every barrier; it was the roaring of a mighty wind, the current of a great river,—prone to overflow and often to spread thinly and unevenly upon shoals and lowlands. Tennyson, though composing an extended work, seeks the utmost terseness of expression; howsoever composite his verse it is



rightly packed and cemented, and decorated in repletion with fretwork and precious stones ; nothing is neglected or nothing wasted, nothing misapplied. You cannot take out a word or sentence without marring the structure, nor can you find a blemish ; while much might profitably be omitted from Byron's longer poems, and their blemishes are as frequent as their beauties. Prolixity, diffuseness, were the characteristic of Byron's time."

Tennyson is a born-observer of physical nature, and as a landscape word painter is intensely true. Sometimes grave and exalted he is equally delicate—an artist of the beautiful in a minute way. This admirably adapts him for being an idyllic poet. The Idyll, as its name denotes, is a little image or picture, containing only two or three human beings in front, with a considerable piece of landscape for a background ; the beings are properly rustic, and the landscape rural. In its aspect and coloring the landscape must be in full accordance with the feelings of the poem ; and indeed the feelings themselves should often be suggested by the mere scenic effect. Tennyson revived from Theocritus the true idyllic purpose, adopting the form mainly as a structure in which is exhibited, with equal naturalness and beauty, the scenery, thought, and manners of his own country and times. In some of them, such as in "The May Queen," "The Miller's Daughters," and "Lady Vere de Vere," the lyric is wedded to the sentiment and picture of the idyll, so as greatly to enhance its beauty.

In his great allegorical poem, made up of a series of separate exquisite idylls, while giving, as he must give, to make it allegorical, ideal pictures of ideal persons, yet are they set against backgrounds more tangible than other artists can draw, making the accessories and even the atmosphere convey the meaning of his poem. These ideal pictures of ideal persons, like those of Spenser's Fairy Queen, are thrown far back into the dim twilight of mediæval times, which casts around them a hallowed glamour, belonging only to the romantic days of ancient chivalry.

Of all the metrical romances which were popular in England in mediæval times those of King Arthur and his Round Table are the only ones which have retained afterwards their popularity, which, no doubt, was greatly owing to their having had introduced into the other chivalrous adventures of their knights those of theirs also in search of the Holy Graël, or Sacred Dish, which gave them an allegorical and religious turn and purpose, better suiting them to the true English taste and feeling. In Sir Thomas Malory's complication of the Arthurian romances a tale was already fashioned for Tennyson's use from which to derive his legends and exalt them with whatsoever spiritual meaning they might require.

Of the several-separate idylls constituting the whole Epic we often become so absorbed in the adventures of the knights and ladies themselves that we fail to note the allegorical meaning contained beneath; yet its actual presence, without our being fully aware of it, may still be affecting our admiration; like as, of the essence of a rose the delicate fragrance proceeding from its heart, of which we are scarcely conscious, may yet be imparting to the outward charm of its hues, even as seen by the eye, an additional beauty. The moral bearing of the whole poem, however, becomes fully manifested and apparent when at the close, through the breaking out of the secret sins gradually admitted and fondly cherished by some, all along increasingly from the first, the noble brotherhood of the stalwart knights of the Round Table, with their charming ladies, notwithstanding their many virtues, becomes finally and forever, yet pathetically and sublimely dissolved.

After the same manner of the Palace of Art, in the end is brought out also the moral teaching, which, as explained by Dr. Bayne, is an allegory of a soul possessed of many gifts, loving beauty and knowledge and even good in so far as goodness may gratify an æsthetic taste, but forgetting that beauty, knowledge and goodness ought to be the vassals unto charity.

'And he that shuts Love out, in turn shall be  
Shut out from Love, and on her threshold lie  
Howling in outer darkness.'

The poet places imaginatively before us a soul in the enjoyment of all delights save spiritual and moral, realizes her experience step by step, and finds, in the concluding stage of that experience the solution of which he is in quest.

"Assuming the title of Idyllic poet," as Mr. Stedman remarks, "Tennyson made the term honored and understood, but he carried his method to such perfection that its cycle seems already near an end, and a new generation is calling for work of a different order, for more vital passion and dramatic power."

But, as the fond expectation of the Welsh and Britons that King Arthur with his knights, in the course of time, would come back to earth again and re-establish their Round Table, has been partially fulfilled and realized in these latter days, by their re-appearance again in the "Idylls of the King," in their ancient armor, performing anew their chivalrous adventures, now more hallowed by time and glorified by art, may we not also expect that, when the commencing dramatic era unsuitable for allegory, shall have run its course, or the æsthetic rage, in pursuit of beauty alone and earthly happiness, shall have expended itself, there will yet arise in the advanced future, some great poet, to produce an allegorical poem of the highest moral beauty and philosophical excellence equal, if not superior, to any that have preceded it, thus bringing back again to earth the departed Virtues?

## ART II.—TRIUMPHS, HOPES, AND AIMS OF RUSSIA.

---

BY J. O. JOHNSON, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

---

DURING the past thirty years very great interest has been awakened amongst all classes of people in reference to Russia. Her frequent wars with Turkey have kept this interest fresh in the mind, and the attempts of the Nihilists upon the life of the Emperor of Russia, and their recent successful issue, have set men to asking, who are the Russians, and what is their history, genius, religion, and outlook for the future?

It is difficult to maintain an attitude of neutrality when dealing with these questions. Men disagree as soon as the subject of the Russians is mentioned. Americans, as a rule, are friendly towards that mysterious people, whilst the English are divided into two diametrically opposite camps. There is an English anti-Russian party and a pro-Russian School, rather than party. For the traditional feeling in England is one of intense opposition to the methods and designs of her great rival, especially in reference to Asiatic politics.

An intelligent opinion can be formed only by studying her past history, and the tendencies underlying it. It is not sufficient merely to know her present *status*, and then to conjecture what she is aiming to become and to do. We shall attempt to give the salient points of her history, genius, customs, and religion; and thus we may conclude, more or less correctly, what the future has in store for Russia and the nations with which she comes into contact. Whilst her foes speak of her as a brutal

despotism, she proclaims herself the champion and defender of the Christians of Eastern Europe, and has thus become the hope of the oppressed subjects of the Sublime Porte.

#### THE EARLY HISTORY OF RUSSIA

is involved in great obscurity. There is no authentic record which goes farther back than a thousand years. The ancient inhabitants were Scythians and Sarmatians. The people are in fact, a complex family, consisting of many tribes Slavic and Scythic, with a mixture of Tartars who came as invaders, and became assimilated with those amongst whom they settled. Hence Napoleon's taunting and contemptuous remark: "Scratch a Russian, and you will find a Tartar."

The foundation of the great Empire was laid in 862 by Prince RURIK, a Chief of the Norman Varangians, who formed the body-guard of the Emperors of the Eastern Roman Empire. Rurik was one of the famous Northmen, the sea-kings, who began at that period to infest England, and a little later settled in Normandy (France), Italy and Sicily. Previous to the coming of Rurik there was, strictly speaking, no Russian nationality or monarchy. France and Germany had already risen to greatness and power under Charlemagne; and England, under Alfred the Great, was beginning to be a leading nation, before a commencement was made in Russia. The British Island had a history stretching back into the past, before anything occurred in Russia which was worthy of being recorded. Her history, properly speaking, begins with the reign of Rurik, A. D. 862; and she is therefore the youngest of the great European powers.

Under Rurik the various warlike tribes of Russia were united as one people; and they continued as loyal subjects of the dynasty of Rurik for 748 years—namely, from 862 to 1610, when the last of the race perished by an uprising of the people; and the Romanoff dynasty began, and still reigns.

The early Slavonian tribes were pagans, and worshipped as

their chief deity Perun; but of their religion, and its beliefs and customs, almost nothing authentic is known. The Norman rulers and their soldiers brought a new religion, which did not displace the old; but the two existed side by side. The Northmen adored their god Odin, in their new home as they had done in the land from which they came. Both religions were destined at a later period to give place to a truer and purer religion.

The first seeds of Christianity were scattered amongst the Russians about the time Rurik came to reign over and elevate the people to a more civilized state. The Varangians had come into contact with the Christian religion at Constantinople; and the Greek emperors and patriarchs made attempts for their conversion. The Patriarch Photius, of Constantinople, boasted in 866 that the Greek Church had made Christians of the Russians and had induced them to renounce their barbarous customs. But such conversions did not take place to any great extent during the first century of the reign of the house of Rurik. The first converts were amongst the soldiers who surrounded the Russian Grand Dukes.

In the middle of the following century (945), the Russian prince Igor concluded a treaty of peace with the Roman empire of the east; and it was then ascertained that a portion of the army swore by "the God of the Christians," instead of using the name of Odin.

The Capital of the Russico-Varangian Empire was Kiew; and there a Christian Church was erected, and dedicated to Elias. Kiew became the centre from which Christian influences spread to other towns of Russia. It is situated on the banks of the river Dnieper, in the south-western portion of Russia. Early Russian political and ecclesiastical history centres around this first capital; as the middle period does around Moscow; and the modern around St. Petersburg.

For a time three religions co-existed: the old Slavonian, the Norman, and the Christian. The superiority of the last became apparent to the mind of the grand princess Olga, and she be-

came desirous of adopting the Christian faith. She journeyed to Constantinople, and was baptized, assuming the new name, HELENA, in the year 957—almost a century after Rurik founded the monarchy.

In 980 her uncle, Vladimir the Great, was baptized. It is said that his conversion was brought about by his looking upon a tablet on which was painted "the last judgment." He married the sister of the Greek Emperor, and thus Russia came to sustain a double relation to the Eastern Empire, a political friendship as well as religious.

Vladimir ordered all the people to be baptized on a given day at Kiew, or Kieff. Some were plunged into the water, others swam into the river, and others sat upon the bank, and were sprinkled whilst the prayers were read. At the same time the idols were destroyed. Christian schools were established at Kiew, and the Bible translated by Cyril was used in religious instruction.

Vladimir's successor, Jaroslaw (1019-1054) carried on the good work still farther by founding schools and monasteries. At Kiew was established the first archbishopric of the Russian Church. Christianity, having so auspicious a beginning, spread rapidly amongst the rude populace into other portions of the country.

It is apparent that Constantinople will ever be regarded by the Russian people as

#### THE CRADLE OF THEIR RELIGION.

In consequence of this fact Russia must always look with deep interest, if not with longing desire of possession, upon that ancient Capital of the Græco-Roman Empire. It is not strange that her rulers and people have always resented its occupancy by the hated Turks. To engage in crusades to rescue it from infidel hands is as natural and reasonable as were the efforts of other Europeans to wrest the Holy City from the Mohammedans. Constantinople is, and must ever be, the holy city of the Russians, and must always remain a coveted prize of the Czars.

In regard to the origin of that ancient Capital of the eastern empire, Mr. Gladstone remarks: "Perhaps the greatest measure ever accomplished by a single man at a single stroke was the foundation of Constantinople; whose empire survived, by a thousand years, that of the elder Rome." Not only the Russians, but three other Christian races look to Constantinople as the mother of their religion; the Slavs of south-eastern Europe, the Wallachs and the Greeks. These four nationalities adhere to the Greek Catholic Church, all according a certain headship to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Situated on a triangle which projects into the Bosphorus Straits, the wealth of two seas pours itself into the magnificent harbor, which is called "the golden horn," on account of the treasures which are there collected. It is the key of Europe and Asia, by which the two continents are opened or closed to each other. The government that holds Constantinople can control the trade of the east and west. It is also a strong military post, convenient for attacking foes on all sides, and not easily assailed by them from any quarter. Its walls were defended by less than eight thousand men in 1453, whilst the besiegers numbered two hundred and fifty thousand; and yet they were unable to capture it, until after nearly two months of hard fighting. The brave Emperor Constantine, the last of the line—worthy namesake of the great founder—fell bravely fighting in the breaches of the walls.

Constantinople was the Capital of the eastern Church until the middle of the fifteenth century, and has since then been the chief seat of the Mohammedan religion. It seems destined to become—let us hope at no very remote future—either the centre of a flourishing Christian empire of south-eastern Europe, or else a part of the Russian empire. The Turk must ere long leave Europe. His star of empire has set. But who shall rule in his stead? This is the vexed question of European politics.

Russia and her sympathizers would like to see the Czar seated upon the throne of the ancient Cæsars. It is of this longing that Edna Dean Proctor sings—



"Hail to the glorious morning,  
When the Cross again shall shine  
On the summit of St. Sophia,  
O city of Constantine !  
And that day of sack and slaughter,  
When the wild, despairing cries  
Of 'Kyrie Eleison' fainter  
Went wailing up to the skies,  
Shall be lost in the splendid triumph,  
As the Church reclaims her own,  
And the Patriarch welcomes our Lord, the Czar.  
To the Caesar's ancient throne !

In the sky of the south at midnight  
We have seen God's flaming sign,  
And we know He will drive the Moslem horde  
As chaff from His sacred shrine.  
Silent will be the muezzin  
As the sun on Asia sets,  
Folded the crescent banner,  
Crumbled the minarets !

"There in the grand cathedral  
Victorious chants we'll raise,  
While the saints look adown with loving eyes,  
And the gems on the altar blaze.  
Hail to the day when the eagles  
And the Cross shall gain their own,  
And the Patriarch welcomes our Lord, the Czar,  
To the Caesar's ancient throne ! "

In the meantime the Christian population of Constantinople must patiently wait until they be delivered from the hard fate which befel them when their city came into possession of the Turks. That Christian capital of Greek and Roman civilization was delivered up to lust and rapine for three days. Its libraries, the depositories of all the works of the ancient writers, were burned, and the ashes scattered to the winds. Over sixty thousand of the population were sold and carried into captivity ; men, women, and children were indiscriminately slaughtered on the pavements of St. Sophia. Churches were plundered of their costly treasures, and the crescent took the place of the cross on their lofty domes. Refinement and civilization gave

place to Mohammedan brutality and lust, gloom covered the oriental world, and letters and learning ceased to be cultivated. For over four centuries the Christians of Turkey have been most cruelly oppressed, only relieved occasionally by the advance of the armies of the North; and thus the Czar has been looked upon as their deliverer. If ever a people deserved the sympathy and commiseration of the world, it is the Christians of Turkey. Nor is it strange that their oppressor has been called "the unspeakable Turk." The religion of the merciful Nazarene was supplanted at the sword's point by the faith of Mohammed, the soldier-prophet. Churches were converted into mosques; and where women and children had for ages knelt together in prayer with their husbands and fathers, now none but men were allowed to worship; the presence of woman would defile the sacred courts—so contemptible is she in the estimation of the followers of the false prophet!

The nations of Europe might have prevented this disaster to the eastern empire and Church by sending a few thousand soldiers to the help of the brave little army which defended Constantinople; but the spirit of rivalry and jealousy refused the needed aid. The Orient was left to its fate; and it has never forgotten or forgiven the western nations. Henceforth it looked to Russia for deliverance.

When Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, and the eastern Empire thus ceased to exist, the Russian Grand Duke John changed his title to that of Czar. The origin of the title is highly significant. John was married to the niece of Constantine, the last Christian ruler of the east; and he now took the title of Czar, or Cæsar, as the Christian emperors were called. By that act he signified that the old Greek Roman empire passed under the protection of the Czar of Russia, as the western Roman empire had acknowledged Charlemagne and the rulers of Germany, 500 years before. The Czars have ever since regarded themselves as the actual protectors of the people who were formerly ruled by Christian

emperors; and it is but natural and human that they should wish at some time to sit upon the throne of the ancient Cæsars in Constantinople.

It would not be in place to attempt to give even a sketch of the history of Russia during the reign of the rest of the Ruriks. The last of the house was Demetrius, who was a pretender, hostile alike to the Russians and their religion, and deeply suspected of trying to introduce the Roman instead of the Greek religion. He perished by a determined uprising of the people against him in 1610. Thus the house of Rurik came to its end in disaster and blood, and a new dynasty was ere long to take its place.

For many years there was war and anarchy. The nobles failed to rule the country or to protect it from its foes. The Poles invaded Russia, but were at last defeated and driven out of the country, mainly through the exertions of the clergy, led by one whose name deserves to be held in honor. FEODOR rose from a humble parish priest to be archbishop of Rostov, and later he became patriarch of Moscow. He had distinguished himself by heroic resistance to the Polish invaders. He was now head of the Russian Church under the name of PHILARET. He had a son named Michael Feodorovitch. The Russians, out of gratitude to the father, elevated the son to the imperial throne.

#### THE ROMANOFF DYNASTY

began with Michael Romanoff, who was *elected* Emperor in 1613, about the time the pilgrims settled in New England. The father was now head of the Church, and the son was head of the Empire. The present Czar is a direct descendant of Michael Romanoff.

We need not give an account of Russia under the Romanoffs, most of whom have gained a world-wide reputation for their ability and their ambitious schemes. Few rulers of any nation are more famous than Peter the Great, his wife and successor Catherine 1st, Elizabeth 1st, and Catherine 2nd.

The Romanoffs have devoted themselves to internal improvements no less than to war and diplomacy, and they have striven hard to make Russia a commercial nation. Treaties of commerce have been entered into with England, France, Persia and China. An overland line of trade has been established across the two Continents, Europe and Asia.

#### MODERN RUSSIA.

The greatest of the Romanoffs was PETER THE GREAT. Under him Russia became an entirely different nation. Its whole character was changed—its customs, manners, and even its dress. Previously the Russians were not a European people, but Asiatics. The civilization of Germany, France, and England was unknown in Russia. But Peter resolved that his country should become like the rest of Europe. He is the great Reformer.

A new army was organized, a sea-coast was taken in war, a fleet was built, foreigners were employed, manufactures were instituted—all for the one object, that Russia might become a European nation. For this he made almost incredible efforts, and underwent all manner of hardships. Himself a giant-barbarian, he yet civilized his country. In his new capital, St. Petersburg, he was more free to carry on his reforms. Canals were built, and sciences and arts were encouraged and patronized by Peter. It would require much space even to enumerate, without describing, the changes everywhere introduced. He was entirely in advance of his countrymen, and met with opposition at every step; but he generally triumphed by his perseverance and energy.

Since the reign of Peter Russia has gone on with her vast internal improvements, and also in ambitious schemes and gigantic wars, adding provinces to her already overgrown empire, which includes one-sixth of the solid surface of the earth! The Northern bear has thus come to be feared and hated by almost all other nations, and sincerely loved by none, excepting

the United States. With our country she has ever been on friendly terms; and this peaceful relation may continue to exist, since our interests do not conflict with hers. If they should do so at any time, it is not at all likely that old friendship would prevent her from assuming a threatening attitude towards us.

Russia has mighty armies, twice the population of any other European nation, and the most cunning and skilful diplomatists that can be found anywhere. Seldom are they outwitted in making treaties and alliances—and in breaking them, it is said, if that suits the purposes of the empire better!

The most glorious act of Russian history was the liberation of nearly 22 millions of serfs in March, 1861—seven times the number of slaves that were freed by President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The Czar won immortal glory by his noble act of liberating the serfs, in a peaceful manner, and without loss to the owners of the serfs. The government indemnified them for their loss. It is a strange coincidence that both these great Liberators should die by the hands of assassins!

Each freedman received also from five to twenty-five acres of land, with a house and a small orchard. Thus every one is a landowner and a householder.

In religion Russia has undergone but little change. Her Church holds on to the old, and rejects the new. It recognizes no general Synod held since A. D. 880. The last thousand years have witnessed but few changes amongst eastern Christians. This has kept them from the influences of scepticism but not from the evils of superstition. They are wonderfully afflicted with reliance on images and relics of saints. Like the Greek Church in general, the Russian Church knows no change, but is intensely conservative. This has kept it from any high stage of enlightenment and development. Progress is the offspring of inquiry and restless endeavor after better things. The Russian Church is far behind the Protestant and Roman Churches in great theologians and missionaries, in theological writings and sacred poetry. It has been a "sleep-

ing giant" these thousand years, whilst the western Churches have gone on in great achievements. Both the zeal of reformers and the spirit of reform seem to be wanting. Nor is there as great freedom of opinion in regard to religion as there is in the western religious world. Cyril Lucaris leaned to the opinions of the Reformer, John Calvin, but was strangled for his belief. That was a summary way of disposing of reformers.

But who can tell what may yet be the future of eastern Christendom? The empire of Russia, which is constantly adding by conquest to its vast extent of territory, adheres tenaciously to the ancient Greek Catholic faith. The Czar is already ruler of vast tracts of Asia; and wherever his armies march, there will Christianity be planted. The signs of the times indicate that Russia may eventually become mistress of central Asia, as she already is of the northern part, and England of the southern portion; and thus the hundreds of millions of Chinese may be converted to Christianity. The Russian Church may yet become a

#### GREAT MISSIONARY INSTITUTION

for the east, as the Protestant and Latin Churches are for the west, north, and south.

The introduction of the Christian religion amongst the hordes of Asia would start them on a new career of greatness. Siberia is already virtually a Christian land, under the influences of the Russian Church. "Not long ago," says Froude, "it was the hunting ground of wandering tribes of hereditary robbers. It is now drilled into quiet and industry. Roads cross it, cities rise over it, and property and life are secure upon it." As Russian power advances in the east, Christianity will advance at the same rate, and bless all with whom it comes in contact. A religion that has raised Russia from a rude and barbarous to a civilized state, can do the same for other nations. There were no less than 100 tribes, living in perpetual warfare, and speaking 40 different languages; now, under the sway of a Christian civilization, all these warring factions dwell together in unity as one great people!

In the early part of this century Greece secured its independence from Turkey, mainly on account of the victory of the Russians over the Sultan at Adrianople. Roumania, Wallachia, Servia, and Bulgaria also recognize Russia as their deliverer. Many persons ridicule the mere mention of the idea that Russia is a liberating power in the east; yet her conquering arms alone have taken the shackles from the oppressed Christians of Turkey. The repressive domestic policy of "the northern bear" cannot be considered wise or merciful; her ambitious designs in the foreign field European powers may well hold in check; but her title of honor as a liberating factor in Eastern Europe cannot be taken from her.

In our day Russia is chiefly noted for its discontent. The Nihilists kept the late Czar in constant terror, until at last they laid him cold in the embrace of death. The cruel deed was done in the name of liberty and human rights. Such is the plea! But liberty spurns the friendship of assassins. A good cause does not sanctify a crime, though committed in its name.

The government of Russia is despotic. Torture and capital punishment are not resorted to, however, except for treason; but criminals are banished to cold and inhospitable Siberia. This exasperates the people; and for this chiefly, it is thought, the Czar has atoned by his death.

The new Czar has ascended the throne of his father under the same title: "autocrat of all the Russias." But there will be no peace for him until he renounces the proud claim of being an autocrat. Representative government of some kind is demanded; and it must eventually be granted. The sooner the better, it would seem to us Americans.

## ART. III.—WILFORD HALL'S NEW PHILOSOPHY.

BY REV. JOHN I. SWANDER, A. M., TIFFIN, OHIO.

A NEW book has made its appearance. It is not so much a fawning candidate for public favor as it is a fearless criticism upon popular fallacy. It is a new book—not in the sense of recent origin, for it is now in its thirty-first edition, and has been in limited circulation, for several years, in one or more of its revised forms—in the sense of its singular interest and amusing novelty. It is not new in the subject which it brings under discussion, for others, before him, have struggled toward the solution of the great problem of human life, here and hereafter. Neither does it sound the alarm of a new enemy upon the field of conflict, but rather recommends a change of munition and tactics in meeting the old armies of the aliens, who continue to say, in their foolish hearts, and argue, in their fallacious theories, that there is no God. It makes no new concessions to the leading champions of atheism. On the contrary, it rises to a point of order and questions both the wisdom and courage of Christian theists, who are charged with surrendering the vantage-ground of eternal truth in their recent acknowledgment of certain claims made by the leading advocates of Evolution. The peculiar freshness of the book consists in its new line of scientific defense of the dogma of God's personal existence, and in the equally scientific justification of the hope of the soul's immortality. This new line embraces both the peculiar stand-point from which it hurls its pointed javelins to



the apparent discomfiture of false science, and the method of its most vigorous assaults upon the strongholds of modern materialism.

Who is A. Wilford Hall? The question will certainly not be regarded as an offensive interrogatory. While he gives undoubted evidence of his distinct and positive individuality, he is nevertheless so modest in his first appearance upon the scientific stage, that it is exceedingly difficult, in the absence of the family record, for any one to trace his lineage. Judging, however, from the evidence of his thorough acquaintance with the entire field of modern science, and from the manner in which his powerful pen is made to wield its sturdy blows at the somewhat plausible theories of those whom he looks upon as the unscientific champions of the age, he is no longer a youth, although he may be, and continue to remain "to fortune and to fame unknown." And it is herewith predicted with self-evident certainty that his fundamental position in philosophy will soon pass away like some comet, whose orbit is an infinitely elongated ellipse, or rise to that magnitude and lustre, which shall cause the other stars of the scientific firmament to pale their relative brightness before its superlative glory. One thing is beyond controversy: the new theory projected in this new book can never crumble away by fragments. It is destined to fall, if fall it must, like the Philistine temple, by the removal of the pillars that support the superstructure; and only when the pillars shall give way, and tumble the temple into ruins, will the world be furnished with another great demonstration of the possibility that a blind man may bury himself under the rubbish of his own Herculean work.

But Wilford is *not* entirely blind. Although he seems to betray a remarkable fondness for sporting with the Delliachs of atheistic scientism, his unusual faculty of discernment will probably protect him from the seductive arts of the Philistine lords. His caressings are rather those of the frisky young feline in its caperings with the impotent little mouse,—an

amusement preparatory to the work of utter annihilation. At this present writing it appears that this young Samson of New York City is not as apprehensive of any immediate violence to his organs of scientific vision, from the uncircumcised Philistines of Evolution, as he is from those whom he seems to regard as the invertebral class of Christian theists. And if his past fidelity to what he holds to be the key-stone principle to the whole arch of scientific investigation, and his present vigilance in seeking to make nothing but logical deductions therefrom, are to be taken as an indication of his future course, it is quite probable that he will not allow himself to be betrayed by false friends, nor suffer his eyes to be gouged out by open enemies. Neither will it do to proclaim him a blind fanatic, full of vagaries and vanity, because he has dared to cross the path of much that enters into the world's most popular thinking. Let it first be demonstrated by a full college of medical oculists (after they have taken the motes out of their own eyes), that his visual organs are actually in a diseased condition. In the meantime, it would be well for those who contemplate the task of showing that this new philosopher is really in danger of afflicting himself and others with the forbidden fruit of his defective vision, to begin their examination without unnecessary delay, for fear that this rising judge in our scientific Israel may hasten to unite the recent theories of conservative theists with those of the open and avowed atheists, in the same laughable manner, that his prototype did the foxes, in a former display of comical pyrotechnics.

The author of this new book takes rank among the inventors of the age. In fact, the dawn of the twentieth century will find him without a peer in this department of intellectual inquiry, if his announced propositions should be sustained by the demonstrative evidence and reasoning brought to bear in the volume of the book. And it is fervently hoped, that, for the sake of variety, if for no better reason, his invention shall prove to be as useful in the sphere of science, as it is ingenious and

ornamental in the world's great cabinet of curiosities. Mr. Edison may appear with the longer list of discoveries in Nature's partially explored domain, but this man claims the credit of bringing before the public an original contrivance, which, if it shall prove to be what its maker confidently expects, must leave the modern master of electricity to look after his laurels. Edison proposes to carry forward his work to such a degree of perfection that shall make it not only possible, but also practicable, to illumine our metropolies, if not our entire Continent, by the mysterious means of manufactured lightning; but our author seems perfectly calm in his intimation that he has discovered a "substance" which renders it not only possible and practicable, but also probable and absolutely certain, that at no distant day the gross darkness of false science shall disappear before the effulgence of that new light, whose intense luminous rays shall kindle a conflagration of the world's combustible fallacies, and usher in the brighter splendor of a more auspicious morn.

Mr. Hall has invented an hypothesis,—one that leaps into existence from the laboratory of no ordinary brain, and gives evidence that it is the joint product of profound thought, extensive research, comprehensive scholarship, and Christian honesty. It is his own legitimate offspring, and, no matter what others may think or say, he prides himself in the bantling of his prolific genius. This new invention is his fortune. While there is no evidence that he has filed his petition for letters-patent, he gives notice of his rightful priority to the honors of this wonderful discovery, and frequently intimates, throughout the book, that he has no intention of shining in a borrowed lustre, when this new sun of scientific splendor shall rise to the zenith of its glory.

Well, this man has a right to invent an hypothesis, or anything else, indeed, that can be made to subserve the purposes and progress of true science, and rout the rats of unscientific sophistry from their verminous nests. The Bible, itself, starts

and proceeds upon the assumption that its Author's existence is a fact never called into question, except by those who are fools at heart. So with each distinct mystery of our holy religion. They are not proven in advance, but projected upon the world for the very purpose of preparing the way for the demonstrative testimony of the truth in which they shall be ultimately vindicated and glorified. The human family, in its intuitive longings for the truth, has a reasonable right to expect that the Author of Revelation will raise the subject-matter of which His Book treats, out of the sphere of the hypothetical, and carry it forward, gradually or otherwise, into the cloudless region of absolute certainty. So has this scientific age a right to insist that the author of "*The Problem of Human Life*" shall raise his new hypothesis to the rank of a rational theory before it is entitled to unqualified regard. The public has no right, however, to insist that he shall answer all questions that may be propounded by his opponents, or projected by his own hypothesis, before he has had reasonable means and time for its demonstration and development. This much he claims and insists upon in common fairness. Alluding to certain admitted forces in nature and facts in science, the author says: "If, after carefully comparing all such facts with my provisional hypothesis, I shall conclude that more phenomena are explained by it, and the various classes of facts made more harmonious and consistent among themselves than by means of any other known hypothesis, it is logical and fair to claim the result of such investigation as a probable scientific theory." Page 416.

The corner-stone of the author's hypothetical superstructure is the assumed existence, around, within, and aboye us, of an invisible, inaudible, and intangible universe of veritable entities. In this bold assumption he seems, at times, to occupy the true Christian stand-point in his earnest search for the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen. Heb. 11 : 1. But when he attempts to carry his philosophy into the sphere of Christian dogmatics, he proves himself a failure. If such

expressions as may be found on page 56 are fairly exponential of his philosophical principles when applied to the great mystery of the Incarnation, and if logical consistency actually requires him to make the application in such forms of speech, we must part company until such future time when he shall see fit to revise that portion of his very valuable book, or the writer of this article be made more able to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. But hear him: "His word became flesh. . . . If this *word* could become *flesh*, it could become *wood*, or *rock*, or *iron* as well. . . . His word was changed into corporeal flesh. . . . He condensed the 'flesh' of Christ from the word of His power." It should be remembered, however, that the above extracts are taken from the author's part of the Wilford-Sheldrake correspondence, in which Wilford, while he has decidedly the best of the controversy, seems, nevertheless, to have been led out of his proper sphere into a country in which he would do well to consult the directions of the guide-post before he proceeds very far in any direction. It is quite probable that the next edition of the book will show either an elimination or improvement of his theology. His field is evidently that of physico-biological science. Here he is at home. Here, too, he is to be admired for consistently holding, in common with many other Christian thinkers, that the mission of true science is to move, not toward the outward and material, but the inward and substantial, until it actually sees the invisible, hears the inaudible, and grasps that intangible something in the vast domain of absolute existence.

Our author launches his philosophical bark upon an ocean of observation and induction sufficiently broad to include God, Man, and Nature. He insists that God is not only a personal Creator, but also a substantial Jehovah,—that He created all things, not of nothing, but out of His own eternal substance, the Fountain from whom all the substances of the universe have proceeded. Man, as also all animals, consists of an incorporeal substance, or invisible organism, of which the corporeal struc-

ture, or body, is the counterpart. Man was not evolved by some impersonal, protoplasmic force, from the moneron, through the monkey, *via* the missing link, but created, or made, by a miraculous act, not "out of things which do appear" (Heb. 11:3),—not of nothing, but of His own all-pervading substance, "even his everlasting power and *divinity*." Rom. 1:20. There is no entity in nature whose existence is in mere molecular motion. However highly attenuated, all force is substance. Passing beyond the generally admitted facts of science, as to the material and substantial existence of *air, light, odor, and electricity*, our philosopher declares that *gravity, magnetism, heat, and sound* are as literally and truly substances as the veritable atmosphere with which we expand our heaving lungs. Then, bravely swinging his scientific flambeau, he advances into the more metaphysical department of philosophical inquiry, ascends the rising scale of a regular gradation, and predicates substantial, entitative being of *life, soul, mind, spirit*, and God—the Fountain of all. In fact, Wilford's new system, if, indeed, it shall prove to be a system, may be called, emphatically, a Philosophy of Substance.

But is it a system? If a system, is it new? Does its appearance mark a new epoch in the world's great history of philosophical inquiry, discovery, and progress? Our author does not claim to have evolved any new principle, and he gives abundant evidence that he is too consistent as a Christian, and too sound as a theist, to arrogate unto himself any creative power. That he has been a devout and apt student of philosophy, especially in the domain of Physics and Biological research, is evident from his manifest intimacy with everything pertaining directly to those important branches of the general subject. He does not claim, like Mohammed, to have journeyed on a white mule to heaven for a revelation of truth, but, in his seclusion, for more than a quarter of a century, from what he regards as the superficial scholasticism of the world, he has been holding communion with the heart of Nature, and noting

the phenomena of its interesting pulsations. During that time, he also had opportunity and means of acquainting himself with the leading orthodox members of the scientific church, as well as her most dangerous heretics, both of the past and present; and now, in this unprecedented age of startling events and stunning announcements, he comes forth to dispense the blessings of his discoveries to all honest and earnest investigators after truth, and drive the Alboraks of atheistic evolution to the utmost boundaries of everlasting contempt. While he shows intimate acquaintance with, and due deference for many of the schools, students, and theories of the past, and acknowledges himself indebted to the ages gone by, as every honest scholar is bound to do, his book is certainly more than the rehash of a kind of meat served at former feasts. His philosophy has a distinct individuality, with features as marked, and as peculiarly its own, as ever were predicable of the theories of Descartes, Newton, or Spinoza; and it remains to be seen whether the future historian's impartial pen shall not record *his* discoveries as more important to the interests of true science, and more abundant in their blessings to the family of man. The superficial student in the history of philosophy, after reading Wilford's book in hasty prejudice, may see nothing but a few fragments of Descartes, or some of his partial admirers or imitators, like Fichte, Hegel, Leibnitz, Kant, or Swedenborg, whose streams of speculation seem to have started at the fountain of Cartesianism; but the scholarly and honest reader cannot fail to see that this new hypothesis of Wilford Hall is not only distinct in its essential elements and features, as well as original in many of its discoveries and arguments, but, also, as far from the metaphysical meanderings of Descartes as it is from the Pantheistic "substance" of Spinoza; as different from the Idealism of Kant and Fichte as it is from the Materialism of Haeckel and Huxley; as remote from the skepticism of Hume and Berkley as it is from the sensationalism of Hobbes and Locke. If Wilford is a copyist, Leibnitz is his model.



Between the two there is, at many points, a marked resemblance, but not in such a sense, or to such an extent, as to destroy in either an equally marked individuality. Wilford is unequal to Leibnitz in the wide range of versatile scholarship, but not inferior in mental activity. Leibnitz, besides philosopher, was jurist, theologian, mathematician, historian, and metaphysician; Wilford is physicist, biologist, and a very sprightly journalist, with metaphysics and mathematics enough to demonstrate the most supreme absurdities of the age. Wilford is exploring regions to which Leibnitz, with all his vast attainments, was a stranger; and gathering flowers from fields hitherto unranked by the pioneers of thought. Wilford's "substance" may be compared with the Leibnitzian "monad" in theory, but Wilford is superior to the philosopher of Leipsic in his attempts to utilize his "substance" for the solution of the practical problems of the age. Whatever defect may hereafter be made to appear in the work of Wilford Hall, one thing at this writing appears reasonably clear,—he is not a plagiarist. His views are his own. They are as honestly possessed as they are ably defended,—as consistently held as they are logically unfolded.

This new book seeks to solve the interesting and momentous problem of human life. The first part, confronted by the admitted throes and threats of physical dissolution, has directly for its object the evidencing, upon scientific grounds, the innate idea and darling hope of conscious immortality. Indeed, this is the objective and ultimate point aimed at, though at times indirectly, throughout the entire work, which may be regarded as three books in one volume. Yet the book is *one*. Each part finds its correlative and complement in each other. The assumption of the substantial, entitative existence of that which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," underlies the whole organic structure of the work, and animates every essential syllogism in its masterly argument. He makes the human soul consist in a real organism, as literal as that of the "outer man," which



perisheth. From this general hypothetic proposition, he proceeds to apply the principles of his philosophy to the more satisfactory solution of the great question of unending human existence, and, consequently, to the more full realization of that golden dream which, even now, brightens the visions of earth's short night, and sweetens the anticipations of Heaven's eternal day.

This theory of the substantial elements and organic structure of the soul implies, according to our philosopher, the substantial nature of God Himself. He says: "The substance of Deity constitutes an infinite and inexhaustible fountain of life and mentality, from which our individual life and mentality come originally as drops." (Emanatio-traducianism?) Creation is an effluence of God, rather than an influence proceeding from Him for the accomplishment of creative acts. He fortifies his position behind the generally admitted scientific axiom, "*From nothing, nothing comes.*" This necessary link in the chain of his argument has already caused such a tinkling as to stir up a polemical hornet-nest in that corner of the Westminster Confession which teaches that God made all things out of nothing. Dr. W. W. Barr, Philadelphia, editor of "The Evangelical Repository," stepped to the front in defense of the faith once delivered to Westminster saints; and declared that it is "believed by Presbyterians, without exception," that God made all things out of nothing—that *ex nihilo nihil fit* may be true as an axiom of science, but untrue as a theological dogma.\* The

---

\* The writer has no disposition to dissent openly from what seems to be the teaching of the Heid. Catechism, Qu. 26. He would only express his sympathy for the venerable little book, in its unfortunate scriptural references to which the doctrine is made to look for inspired authority and support. Rom. 1: 20 and Heb. 11: 3 are the very passages relied upon, with confidence, by those who teach that God did not make all things out of nothing, but out of "the invisible things:" "So that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear, but (inferentially) of things which do not appear." And it was probably the evident teaching of such passages as these, together with his scientific acumen, that led the eminent Christian scholar,—Rev.

correspondence upon this point in theological science, between our author and Dr. Barr, will lead the honest reader toward the conclusion that everything, except the first section in the fourth chapter of the Westminster Confession, has been made out of something substantial.

In this Wilford-Barr correspondence concerning the nothingness of God's manufacturing material, the publishers of *The Problem of Human Life*, at the suggestion and under the promptings of the author, took a tilt, in a manner that complicates the amusing controversy. The publishers quote, approvingly, from a "masterly paper," prepared by "A Presbyterian of the Diocese of Ohio," on the "Kingdom of God," and published in the July number (1879) of this REVIEW. Hall & Co. seem, however, to have been under a false impression when they mentioned this REVIEW as a "Presbyterian Quarterly." They seem, also, not to have known that the writer of said "masterly paper," although a "Presbyter," was no Presbyterian, but a minister with a long line of Reformed ancestry, and consequently with little theological resemblance to men who profess to have been made "out of nothing." A Primer in Modern Church History might be of service in the school of this new philosophy, since the discussions arising therefrom will unavoidably, at times, carry the war into the adjacent ecclesiastical territory.

Our philosopher, in his new departure from much which has been idolized by the devotees of science, in the blind veneration of the past, turning his face to the morning of a better day, claims to have discovered the very Gibraltar of truth, upon which its embannered hosts may stand, and from whose impregnable fortress they may hope to carry the campaign into the empire of Evolution, storm its strongest citadels, and utterly

---

Joseph Cook,—to affirm: "*It is not my belief that everything was created from nothing.*" *Lectures on Heredity*, p. 121. "All things finite were created. From what? From nothing? No. Is matter an effluence of the Divine Mind? In one sense, yes." *Heredity*, p. 189.

overthrow the braggart battalions of Materialism, which have so defiantly insulted the armies of the Living God. The first grand assault is already being made. The mountains of scientific fallacy and atheistic absurdity are made to tremble before the booming thunders of this new artillery. It is an interesting spectacle to the thousands who watch the battle from afar. How thrilling to those whose martial faces are aglow with expectations of the coming, crowning victory.

The third part of the book, "*Evolution Evolved*," is among the most masterly arguments of the 19th century in defense of true science and the Bible. Its position is consistent with the profession of a scientific theist; its treatment of opponents is fair and impartial, and, at times, even magnanimous; its logic is convincing, and its main arguments, throughout, appear as unanswerable as the pure syllogisms of eternal truth. Wilford approaches and examines the Darwinian, Huxleyan, and Haeckelian theories of Evolution with a candor that leaves no room for jugglery, and handles them with an ability that has no need of fallacious reasoning. Darwinism is analyzed in a manner that reveals its inconsistencies, and exposes its self-contradictions. Under the unimpeachable testimony of facts it is shown to be unworthy of respect. When weighed in Wilford's new balances it is found equally wanting in truth, reason, and common sense. Absurdities are made to shoot out at every joint. These are shown up in a manner sufficiently ludicrous to make the monkey laugh at the predicament of his pitiable posterity. The "Spontaneous Generation" of Prof. Haeckel is brought under the calcium light of such a thorough examination as to expose the weakness of its miserable pretensions, and tumble it into rubbish by the weight of its incoherencies. The "moneron," which the materialistic Professor exalts to heaven, and places upon the throne of Creative Omnipotence, as the primordial parent of all organic existence, is thrust down to the most unscientific hell. The laws of "Ontogeny," "Philogeny," "Biogeny," and "Embryological Development," including the

"Little Human Tail" of the big German scientist, which have been relied upon as of so much importance in bolstering up a baseless theory, are examined, and found to be subversive rather than supportive of a system which is equally destitute of head and "tail." Darwin's hypotheses of "Pangenesis" and "Gem-mules" are subjected to a merciless mathematical test, which leaves the reader in doubt as to whether the laugh ought to come in or the pity come out. Our author then shows conclusively, that while the "Missing Link" is so earnestly sought after by Evolutionists, as something so absolutely necessary to the consistency of their claims, its very absence chants hallelujahs of praise to the God of true science and Revealed Religion. The doctrines of "Natural Selection" and "Survival of the Fittest" are unmasked, analyzed, arraigned upon the charge of false pretense, convicted upon the testimony of their own witnesses, and scientifically damned.

Having thus fairly and fully shown that the Evolution theory of Darwin and his collaborators is simply a system of superlative silliness; that their only redeeming trait is ignorance of scientific facts; their fundamental fault an unwillingness "to retain God in their knowledge;" that their merited retribution follows according to the ordination of Him "who gave them over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient" (Rom. 1:28),—our author introduces his own hypothesis as the key which is to open the store-house of Nature's ten thousand mysteries. He speaks; hear him: "I lay down the position, without the fear of it ever being successfully met, that no substantial effect can be produced on any object without an absolute substance of some kind connecting the cause with the effect. . . . I conceive it [a] principle of philosophy that life and mind are substantial entities as really and truly as are the most ponderable physical objects." Page 464. "I believe that until this great underlying truth shall be duly comprehended and recognized, physiologists, with all their laborious and histologic researches, even with the most powerful micro-

scopes to aid them, will never penetrate even the cuticle of science as regards the true cause of physiological phenomena." Page 466. "As organic life is a substantial entity and could only come from a pre-existing fountain of life,\* hence the solution is clear that the life and mental powers of every organic creature originated primordially as infinitesimal atoms of God's own self-existent, vital and mental being; and thus it becomes as naturally and consistently a scientific solution of the origin of life as that the existence of God (as the author claims to have shown on page 444) is an unavoidable scientific truth." Page 472.

Holding that the above position is scientific without being unbiblical, and alleging that the assumption of its truth will answer more difficult questions, and solve more phenomena in Nature than any other hypothesis ever advanced, Wilford claims the respectful consideration and earnest co-operation of all who may desire to go up, under the leadership of this new Joshua, to drive out the atheistic Canaanites and possess the scientific land of promise. He also intimates, very clearly, his desire to receive no recruits except those who are willing to burn their ships behind them, and demand an unconditional surrender of the Evolution army. His watchword is: *No compromise with Godless Materialism*. Evolution as taught in Europe and echoed in America is an abomination of desolation standing in the holy place. While agreeing in the main with those thorough scholars and radical thinkers,—Rev. Joseph Cook and Dr. McCosh,—he doubts both their wisdom and courage in accepting Evolution with certain theistic modifications. He thinks that the great Boston lecturer and the President of Princeton College have pursued a course that appears more

---

\* "I suppose Almighty God evolves the seen Universe of matter and the unseen of finite force from Himself." Joseph Cook on Heredity, p. 121. "He has given a substance to the soul; He has given a substance to matter. The two substances, we say, are utterly unlike. There is one thing in which they are common: they have the same origin." *Heredity*, p. 183.

like beating a parley with the opposing forces than it does like battling bravely with the Gogs and Magogs of modern infidelity.

The second part of this radical and revolutionary book is a treatise on the *Evolution of Sound*, embracing 260 pages, and, as not necessarily essential to its completeness, ought to have been attached as a very valuable appendix, rather than allowed to break in upon the very heart of the main subject more directly under consideration. It is unquestionably a specimen of the most interesting reading ever offered both to the scientific scholars and intelligent thinkers of any age or country. The author charges that the prevailing theory of "sound" is absolutely *unsound*. More; he is in danger of proving every charge alleged in the indictment. It would be impossible, in the limited space allowed for this paper, to give an adequate idea of the author's demonstrative arguments against the theory so successively and successfully assailed. The writings of the three leading physicists of the age—Tyndall, Helmholtz, and Mayer—are examined, and their theories, when turned against themselves and against each other, are found to be crooked enough and hollow enough to dispense with the service of rams' horns in trumpeting down the walls of this unscientific Jericho. He points out scores of inferential suppositions to which the current wave-theory stands committed, and which, in common consistency, its advocates are bound to defend, and then shows that they are as absolutely untenable as they are superlatively ridiculous.

A few of the implied teachings necessarily involved in the undulatory theory of sound may here be mentioned, if for no other purpose, to afford a little seasonable merriment. 1st. The current theory compels a cricket to chirp and churn four cubic miles of atmosphere, whose aggregate weight is 120,000,000 of tons, with the churn-dasher moving "to and fro" 440 times per second, stirring the whole mass into sound-waves, and by its "condensations and rarifications" generate heat enough

to add one-sixth to the velocity of sound according to the invented law of Laplace. Page 130. 2nd. The theory requires a locust, whose stridulations can be heard at a distance of one mile by rasping its leg across its wing, to wield a power equal to that of all the steam-engines in the United States. Page 147. 3d. It also compels the poor little locust to beat the "drum-skins," or move the tympanic membranes of all the persons who could find standing room within the compass of its limited omnipotence. These "drum-skins" or tympanic membranes, according to Prof. Tyndall (Lectures on Sound, pp. 4, 5, 49, 69), are thrown into vibrations, "once in and once out;" and, according to our author's test of their avoirdupois, 16,000 of them would weigh one pound. Now, if persons enough were brought together to fill the cricket's capacious auditorium, the tympanic membranes in the aggregate would amount to such a ponderous mass of drum-skins as to weigh *two thousand million tons*. This mass of matter must be shaken, according to the laws of mechanical force, or the cricket will be in danger of losing his position as a very important agent to the firm of Tyndall, Helmholtz, Mayer & Co. Certainly such a weight of absurdity in drum-skins, and such a caricature on common sense in the name of science, should be enough to laugh the cricket out of countenance, even if it should fail to drive the advocates of the wave theory from the rickety ramparts of their monstrous imposition.

The author also (p. 105) explodes the magazine theory, by which he shows that *it is not the thunder which strikes and kills*, as the apostles of sound-waves actually teach. He makes the following quotation from the writings of Prof. Tyndall (Lectures on Sound, p. 23), in which that learned physicist is made to suffer most terribly by the explosion which he describes:—"The most striking example of this inflection of a *sonorous* wave that I have ever seen was exhibited at Erith after the tremendous explosion of a powder magazine, which occurred there in 1864. The village of Erith was some miles distant



from the magazine, but in nearly all cases the windows were shattered, and it was noticeable that the windows turned away from the origin of the explosion suffered almost as much as those which faced it. . . . Every window in the church, front and back, was bent inwards. In fact, as the *sound-wave* reached the church it separated right and left, and for a moment the edifice was clasped by a *girdle of intensely compressed air*." Following this quotation, in his usual, vigorous and confident style, our new physicist calls upon his readers to observe that "no distinction is even hinted at" between "the *girdle of intensely compressed air*," caused by the sudden generation of gas, and the "*sound-wave*" (?) which appeared to accompany the concussion. The announcement is then made in the language of no *uncertain sound*, and the implied challenge is confidently laid at the doors of these world-renowned acousticians, and fearlessly flung across the pathway to every seat of scientific investigation throughout the world, that "*the condensed air-waves, or atmospheric concussion, which breaks a window at a distance from an explosion of powder will be found, when tested, to be altogether a different effect from the sound produced by the same explosion, and that it [the air-wave] will also be found to travel at a different velocity, which velocity will be in proportion to the quantity of gas added, and the distance the condensed wave has traveled.*" From the above it does appear, at this writing, that the author has wisely chosen the field upon which to test the relative strength of the two opposing theories in the science of acoustics. The case involves, at least, an important principle of science, and is likely to evolve the impending conflict. Upon whose banner shall the bird of victory perch? Just think of Miltiades with his little band of fearless friends rushing down upon the battle-plains of Marathon to meet the marshalled millions of a benighted continent! There is intense anxiety in the minds of many. Leverrier was justified in his prediction, based on mathematical calculation, concerning the existence, location, and discovery of Neptune. Is



Wilford to be sustained by the truth of his scientific prophecy? How unequal, in appearance, the opposing forces! Is the current wave theory of sound, with its prestige and popular following, to seek our young philosopher's life and destroy it, or is our Hercules to reach from his scientific cradle and strangle the old dragon of unscientific fraud?

Passing through the system for the purpose of pointing out a few of the absurdities to which it stands committed, Wilford takes up the tuning-fork and strikes it against a resonant body and throws its prongs into tremors. Then, conceding the correctness of the estimate of their aggregate velocity to be about 8 feet per second, he asks the scientific world, with an air of triumphant exultation, to point out the man of scholarly reputation who will have the recklessness to say that the air-waves thus started off at the rate of 8 feet per second have power to increase their velocity 120 times, and travel, after leaving the prongs or resonant body, as sound is known to be transmitted, at the rate of 1120 feet per second. But the supreme absurdity of this *argumentum ad ignorantiam* is made to appear in its most unscientific nakedness when our author shows that the wave theory of sound is bound to operate by wooden-waves, glass-waves, and iron-waves, and with increased velocity, whenever sound is transmitted through these material substances. Is the scientific world ready to admit the truth of what is here declared to be a logical necessity in the system so cruelly criticised? Are the advocates of this old doctrine of transmission by air-waves ready to say, over their own signatures, that sound, in passing through a rock, or a mountain of iron, actually throws the whole mass into such vibratory motion as to cause the particles to move "to and fro" into "condensations and rarefactions," causing each atom of such material bodies to change its position 440 times per second? If not, will some one please step forward and answer this juggler in a manner that shall in the future keep him back from presumptuous sins, and forever paralyze the spluttering pen of this pestilent fellow,

who seems to be a setter forth of strange doctrines? In the meantime Wilford has a right to be heard; and it is predicted that he cannot be hissed from the stage because, forsooth, he has the courage to say to that most popular heresy: so far shalt thou go and here shall thy *waves* be stayed. No wonder that his whole resonant being is shocked into tremors of vibratory indignation as he analyzes a fundamental fallacy, which, for ages, has been palmed off for truth upon the credulity of mankind, and is still taught for science amidst the startling discoveries and intellectual achievements of the 19th century.

But Wilford Hall is not a philosopher of the pessimistic school. Having torn down the edifice of error, he proceeds to build the temple of truth. Having shown, as he believes, that the undulatory theory of sound is made up of contradictions and inconsistencies, embroidered with innocent ignorance of Nature's laws, he introduces his own hypothesis of *corpusecular emissions*. Here, as elsewhere, in the line of the main argument throughout the book, his modern *monad* is brought to the front. Sound is a substance as really and truly as odor, heat, electricity, magnetism, gravity, or light.

He denounces "molecular motion" as an instrument of nimble jugglery when used as the convenient scapegoat of false reasoning. Here Wilfordism must stand or fall. The new theory of sound starts with the assumption of such a substance. From this point it must run the gauntlet to early defeat or final victory. The writer predicts a victory, and herewith puts the prediction upon record. The theory may be obliged to lay aside some weights which do not belong to its essential constitution, and some besetting sins which adhere as the results of its founder's fallible nature; but in the end it will reach the goal and triumph gloriously. If, however, it should fail in the race, or fall in the battle, it will, at least, have made a valuable contribution to the cause of true science, in having shown that the wave theory stands impeached by the testimony of unanswerable facts, and must, sooner or later, fall before the irresistible force of its own most manifest inconsistency.

No adequate idea of the author's position can be given by quoting from or commenting upon this masterly treatise now challenging the attention of the scientific world. The law governing the generation and propagation of sound, as understood by our philosopher, is stated on page 93, and is as follows: *It is not the mechanical effect of the numerous short motions back and forth on the surrounding air which generates the tone of a fork or string, but it is the molecular effect of the sudden stops and starts on the atomic structure of the instrument itself, causing thereby the emission of the substantial pulses we call Sound, while the atmosphere, wood, water, or iron, through which they pass, is but their conducting medium,—any motion of such medium, caused at the time by the vibration of the sound-producing body, being but incidental.* The foregoing is enough to show that the new hypothesis is at least different from, if not superior to, the old theory. In this new departure he has broken with much that enters into the popular teaching of the age, and it will not be considered strange if he should fall under its most furious assaults. No established theory of science, true or false, has ever been known to surrender without a struggle. It is therefore a matter of most thrilling interest to those who are standing tip-toe on the promontory top of scientific inquiry to know just what the advocates of the old theory may, can, or must say in their attempts to defend their system against the charge of absolute emptiness. Will they keep silence? or will they say that Wilford is an unscientific crank,—a root out of dry ground,—because, forsooth, he does not come before the world badged with the titulary toys of scholastic favoritism? While he is sapping the foundation and thundering at the gates of their ancient (air) castle, will they attempt to “laugh a siege to scorn,” or continue to maintain their significant reticence? in the hope that he may soon pass into obscurity for want of that literary fame which the world so frequently manufactures for

“The bookful blockhead ignorantly read  
With loads of learned lumber in his head.”

Something must be done. The situation is becoming serious. This man charges us with teaching nonsense for science. What is worse, he is about to show that the accusation is founded in truth. Be we men and suffer such dishonor? What is our crime that he should tell us so much truth when we are so unwilling to receive it? Simply this: "After the manner which he calls heresy, so worship we" at the scientific shrine of our fathers. Our wave-theory is older than the Christian era. Is that not saying enough in its favor? It comes "thundering down the ages," and although "its intensity decreases as the square of the distance," its tones are yet sufficiently loud to blow the bugle for a counter-charge. In passing upon the relative merits of competitive theories in science, Wilford seems to overlook the opinion of many that age and popular endorsement ought to be taken into consideration as of more primary importance than mere truth, demonstrative argument, and absolute certainty. Then what is still more humiliating to us of the orthodox persuasion is the absence of all testimony that he has ever graduated in any regular college, or cantered over the curriculum of a university to the laurels which have already commenced to enwreath his brow. True, he gives abundant evidence of more than ordinary natural ability and intellectual attainments; a close student of nature; a bold adventurer in his search for truth; a match for any man who has yet dared to meet him on the field of scientific controversy; yet we are not aware that he has a diploma, and we are quite certain that he has never been applauded by a Boston audience in Tremont Temple. If we must abandon the sacred old theory to which we are bound by every tie of mistaken friendship, and to which we are committed by every consideration, except that of fidelity to truth, for a new gospel in science, which neither we nor our fathers have known, let us, at least, have an evangelist whose lineage and literary prestige shall heal our wounded pride and palliate the pains of our prejudice. If we may not have an apostle from the Chair of Natural Philosophy in the Royal

Institution of Great Britain, nor a leader like Professor Helmholtz from Berlin, nor a celebrated acoustician like our own American scholar, Alfred Marshall Mayer, give us some other star of acknowledged magnitude and lustre to go before us out of Egypt; but as for this modern Moses cradled in the rushes of obscurity—this Wilford Hall we will not—well—

Seriously, something *must* be done. A gentleman at the writer's elbow, with more modesty than money, seriously contemplates a donation of \$10,000 towards the endowment of a Professorship of Physics, with special reference to instruction in the department of acoustics, in some college or university of learning in America, whose faculty will unanimously step forward first, and, over their own signatures, in the columns of this REVIEW, successfully defend the wave theory as taught by Tyndall, Helmholtz, and Mayer, and echoed by the standard acoustical text-books and most popular institutions of learning throughout the world. The defense of the old theory must consist in part of a reasonable refutation of the numerous arguments, and a reasonable answer to the many objections urged against the undulatory doctrine, by A. Wilford Hall in his *Problem of Human Life*. Until such a warfare, defensive and offensive, shall have been successfully waged, there can be no security that the strong man, who has been keeping his palace since the days of Pythagoras, can continue to possess his goods in peace. If, after a thorough discussion in this REVIEW, as to the relative merits of the two theories, the question should still be left in doubt, the matter may be referred for final decision to a class of common-school boys, or to any jury of scientific scholars who have not been deprived of their literary manhood by the blind tyranny of arbitrary scholasticism. The above project is not meditated in the pains of a plethoric purse, neither in the spirit of blunt, bluff, nor bluster, but from the fear that much now taught for "Sound" is only noise about something very *unsound*, and from a desire to

"Let truth be seized wherever found,  
On heathen or on Christian ground."

It remains, to many, an unsettled question, to which the scientific future alone can give a full and satisfactory answer, as to what part this new philosophy shall play in the coming, closing scenes of the world's intellectual theatre. One thing, however, is already a noticeable fact: the doctrine, be it true or false, is making many converts. Recruits are falling into line without much beating of the drum. Few books have left the American press to meet a warmer greeting than *The Problem of Human Life*. These greetings and recommendations have been given by a class of Christian and scientific journals not quoted in the market of commercial literature. Many of them are even extravagant in their flattering testimonials of approval. Thousands of intelligent thinkers have voluntarily forwarded to the author their expressions of delight in the reception and reading of the masterly work. Professors in some of our colleges, and in some cases whole faculties, have announced, after experimental tests, the correctness of some of Wilford's new discoveries, and their willingness to do proper penance in the future for having taught fraud for science in the past.

But our philosopher must not expect to enter the paradise of immortal fame, except through the purgatory of persecution. Others have passed that way before him. Columbus was treated with indignity by the Old World because he had discovered new realms beyond the ocean. Galileo was imprisoned for teaching some of the very truths which have since been formulated into a section of the world's scientific creed. Harvey lost his medical practice because of his great physiological discovery. Jenner's prophylactic contribution to medical science was first denounced as diabolical; soon after an attempt was made to rob him of the merits of his invaluable discovery. So must Wilford prepare himself for the baptism with which other advanced thinkers have been baptized. This, no doubt, he expects. He is too much of a philosopher not to anticipate the inevitable. Ignorance and prejudice will, as

usual, seek to obstruct the purest streams of the world's scientific overflow. Already have the mutterings of disapprobation been heard. Sharp criticisms have been made upon the author's philosophical position, and exceptions have been filed against some of his arguments and conclusions. He is charged with "Materialism" and "Pantheism." These criticisms and charges have, in the most important cases, led to correspondence and controversy, in which the critics were either converted or driven into sullen silence. Professor Tyndall has written from London that "it is an infinitely amusing book." Yes, and it will probably prove to be infinitely more amusing in that great hereafter, which seems to be close at hand, when the wave theory of sound and the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, with many other exploded fallacies, shall be entombed together in the one family vault of merited oblivion.

In the meantime, let the vanguard of the world's brightest intellect move on, accelerated by the momentum of its own progress, and stimulated by the beneficence of its own achievements, until it shall be glorified in the vindication of the Christian Scriptures. And another book was opened, which is *The Problem of Human Life*. Out of these books let the dead theories of the past and present be judged. May their contents be properly understood in searching for the substance of things hoped for, and their suggestions lead through more legitimate efforts, to realize the sublimest possibilities involved in the dignity and destiny of man. Then shall the students of Nature and the disciples of Revelation learn war no more. Science and Religion shall robe themselves in the garments of truth, not only to minister as priests at the altar of the Most High, but also, as heaven's anointed prophets, proclaim throughout the land, and unto all the inhabitants thereof: Hear, oh Israel, the Lord thy God is ONE God.

ART. IV.—PENTATEUCH—CRITICISM: ITS HISTORY AND  
PRESENT STATE.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D.D.

*Part Second.*

It soon became apparent that the Fragmentary Hypothesis, as advocated by Vater and Hartmann, was untenable and must give place to some other, which could do justice to the unity of plan manifest throughout the Pentateuch. De Wette (born 1780, died 1849) forms the connecting link <sup>(1)</sup>. In his earlier criticism, <sup>(2)</sup> influenced largely by Vater, he was negative and skeptical. He held that no part of the Pentateuch was written before the time of David, and strongly asserted the fragmentary character of the books. The narratives were originally separate, and were collected at different times by several compilers, who, owing to lack of materials, have left large and important gaps, and often give us only a brief and disconnected history. Genesis he regarded as consisting of two heterogeneous ele-

<sup>(1)</sup> To De Wette, by the way, the German Reformed Church owes a lasting debt of gratitude for the zeal he displayed in behalf of the Theological Seminary, when in its infancy. He felt a deeper interest in it, perhaps, than any other German theologian. He wrote various communications to the religious journals, in which he presented its claims and solicited contributions of money and books. Let not his heresies, theological and critical, blind the church of to-day to his meritorious works!

<sup>(2)</sup> In his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das alte Testament*, Vol. I., 1806, Vol. II., 1807, and in the earlier editions of his *Lehrbuch der historisch kritischen Einleitung*, of which the first was issued in 1817, and the sixth, the last by his own hand, in 1845. Since his death there have been two editions, the last by Schrader, 1869.



ments, distinguished by the divine names Elohim and Jehovah, but he was in doubt as to their original relations as well as to the method pursued by the compiler. In the Elohistie parts he traced an original plan, but not in the Jehovistic, which he thought were borrowed from various sources. The compiler of Genesis was also the compiler of Exodus, in the beginning of which at least he employed the Elohim document. De Wette places him in the time between David and Joram. Leviticus is wholly fragmentary, and was collected at a later time than the first two books; while Numbers was a supplement to the earlier compilations. Deuteronomy was composed last of all, inasmuch as it presupposes the legislation of the three middle books. It was assigned by De Wette to the age of Josiah king of Judah.<sup>(1)</sup>

De Wette was thoroughly honest and kept his mind open for whatever new light might appear. He is commonly ranked among the destructive critics, and rightly, if we consider only his early scientific career. His position, however, was unique. He belonged to no school, but learned from all. Consequently his views underwent constant modification. With the advance of criticism he saw weak points in his opinions of the origin of the Pentateuch, and, giving up the notion that the several books were collected at different times by various compilers,<sup>(2)</sup> he held with Bleek, to whom this change of view was immediately due, to a threefold redaction of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, viz., an Elohistie, a Jehovistic, and a Deuteronomic; the first of which he placed not before the time of the kings, the second considerably later, and the third in the time of Josiah.

The Fragmentary Hypothesis, which resolved the Pentateuch into bits containing separate narratives arranged according to no definite plan, could not long maintain its ground. There is

(1) This opinion he expressed as early as 1805 in his *Dissertatio qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum alius cujusdam recentioris opus esse demonstratur*.

(2) So in the fifth (1840) and the sixth (1845) editions of his *Lehrbuch*.

a unity, if not of authorship, yet at least of design, running through the book in its present form; and this Ewald, in his youthful essay, *Die Composition der Genesis*, 1823, did much to show. As soon as the plan and arrangement of the Pentateuch became apparent, the theory of the Fragmentists was doomed, and was superseded by another commonly called the *Supplementary Theory*.

This differs from the Documentary Theory in that while the latter assumes *two or more* independent and continuous documents, which were woven into one connected narrative by a redactor, taking his materials now from one and now from another, the Supplementary Theory assumes *only one* connected historical document (the *Elohistic*), which was enlarged by a second hand, that of the *Supplementer* (*Ergänzer*), by the insertion here and there of additional matter, just as if only one of our four gospels had been written and had at a later time received supplementary additions, whether from oral or written sources. Hence the name *Fundamental Writing* (*Grundschrift*), given to the Elohistic document, because it lies at the basis of the Pentateuch, and the claim that this document possesses a unity wanting in the Jehovistic sections which constitute the supplementary additions.

This theory is most ably presented by Bleek, who (born 1798, died 1859) was one of the most distinguished Biblical scholars of Germany.<sup>(1)</sup> According to him the Pentateuch contains much that is genuinely Mosaic. This is true especially of the legislation. Many laws have come down to us exactly in the form in which they proceeded from the pen of Moses; for in

---

(1) For Bleek's view see *Einige aphoristische Beiträge zu den Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, in Rosenmüller's biblisch-exegetisches Repertorium (Band I., 1822); *Beiträge zu den Forschungen über den Pentateuch*, Studien und Kritiken, Heft 3, 1831; and his *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, a posthumous work, of which the first edition, edited by Bleek's son and A. Kamphausen, with preface by K. I. Nitzsch, was published 1860, and the last edition, much altered, by J. Wellhausen, 1878. The second edition, 1865, was translated into English by G. H. Venables, Esq.

a later age they would have taken a different shape, with no allusions, such as we now find, to the wilderness, the camp, to Aaron and his sons. Other laws, it is true, belong to a later age and differ from the genuine Mosaic laws, though they harmonize with them in spirit and render them more suitable to the altered circumstances of a later time. There is much else, however, in the Pentateuch that proceeded from Moses or was written in the Mosaic age, such as the songs, the several accounts of the numbering of the people, and the list of the stations in the wilderness. Besides, there were early records of events that transpired between the death of Moses and that of Joshua, particularly respecting the division of the land among the several tribes. But in all probability neither Moses nor any of his contemporaries wrote a continuous history of that time, still less one in which the whole legislation was interwoven, as is the case in the Pentateuch.

The first continuous historical work of which distinct traces remain to us, is that of the *Elohists*, so named because up to the time of Moses it always designates God *Elohim*. It dealt connectedly with the history from Creation down to the death of Joshua, enlarging, however, only on the chief epochs, which it connected by short genealogical lists. It included, moreover, the Mosaic legislation, containing especially those laws which show themselves by their form to be genuinely Mosaic, as well as the songs and other documents of the ages both of Moses and of Joshua, so far as they were known to the author. It contained, therefore, the largest part of the first four books of the Pentateuch, besides the account of the death of Moses (Deut. xxiv. 1-8) and the greater part of the book of Joshua. Its composition took place in all probability in the age of Saul, and it is in this work that the ancient history of the people of the covenant has received the essential type which it now bears in the Pentateuch, at any rate up to Deuteronomy.

This work was enlarged and revised by a somewhat later author, the *Jehovist*, probably in the age of David. The Elohistic document remained the basis; but it was augmented by

many new sections, which the author sometimes met with in written form and sometimes wrote down from oral tradition. The earlier narratives were remodelled by means of additions and alterations, as well as by abridgements and omissions, in places where the Jehovist made use of sources drawn from other quarters as to the same circumstances and events, and in treating the pre-Mosaic history, he employs the name *Jehovah* as the peculiar designation of God from the beginning of creation onward. The Elohist document, as supplemented by the Jehovist, embraced (1) the first four books of the Pentateuch, nearly as we now have them, with the slight exception of Lev. xxvi. 3-45; (2) the narratives taken from the Elohist as to the death of Moses (Deut. xxxiv. 1-8), and the book of Joshua in the form in which the Deuteronomist met with it.

The Pentateuch and the book of Joshua received their present form and extent from the hands of the *Deuteronomist*, who wrote the book of Deuteronomy (ch. i.-xxxiii.) in opposition to the worship in the high places, and to enjoin the legal worship of *Jehovah* as the true God. With this intent he repeats the Mosaic laws, as they had been delivered in the preceding books, in their spirit and actual import, sometimes modifying them so as to adapt them to altered circumstances and sometimes adding new laws referring to a new state of things, as, for example, the law of the king. This work the Deuteronomist inserted in the earlier work as supplemented or revised by the Jehovist, only here and there making certain changes and additions, particularly in the history of the time of Joshua. In the first books of the Pentateuch the only changes, perhaps, are the insertion of Lev. xxvi. 3-45, and some transpositions, as Deut. iv. 41-43 (the three cities of refuge beyond the Jordan) and xxvii. 1-8 (the altar erected on Ebal). The date of the composition of Deuteronomy and of the last revision of the whole work Bleek places in the reign of Manasseh, king of Judah, in the first half of the seventh century B.C.; in any case before the eighteenth year of Josiah, when the book of the Law found in the Temple was made use of by that king.

Substantially the same view was held by Tuch,<sup>(1)</sup> who places the Elohist in the time of Saul and the Jehovist in the time of Samuel.

Stähelin is of a somewhat different opinion.<sup>(2)</sup> According to him the Elohist wrote in the time of the Judges, between B.C. 1400 and B.C. 1300, and his history, extending from the creation of the world to the taking possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites, contained a large part of Genesis, the largest part of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and the geographical or middle part of the book of Joshua. In his *Untersuchung* he does not regard Moses as the author of any part of the Pentateuch, though in his *Specielle Einleitung*, 1862, he says: "The laws contained in the original document of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers were certainly written in the Mosaic time, and during the journeying through the Wilderness, since there are references in them to dwelling in camps." This Elohist document was, in the time of Saul, edited and supplemented by the Jehovist, to whom we are indebted for the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua in the form in which they have come down to us, and for the book of Judges, with the exception of the Appendix, and the original sources of First Samuel. Thus Stähelin found but two authors for the Pentateuch and Joshua, and accordingly identified the Deuteronomist and the Jehovist, who was perhaps Samuel or one of his scholars.

The question of the composition of the Pentateuch and Joshua is discussed by Von Lengerke in the introduction to his "Canaan," especially in section v.<sup>(3)</sup> He finds, *first*, a *Fundamental Document* (*Grundschrift* or Elohist), which carries the history from creation to the division of the land by Joshua, and was written in the first part of the reign of Solomon;

(1) *Commentar über die Genesis*. Halle, 1838.

(2) *Kritische Untersuchung über den Pentateuch, die Bücher Josua, Richter, Samuel's und der Könige*. Berlin, 1843.

(3) *Kenan, Volks- und Religions-geschichte Israels bis zum Tode des Josuas*. Königsberg, 1844.

secondly, the *Jehovistic Supplementer*, who, about the time of Hezekiah, enlarged the Elohistie Document and gave us the first four books of the Pentateuch in their present form, with Deut. xxxi. 14–33, and the history of the partition of Canaan; and thirdly, the *Deuteronomist*, who, in the reign of Josiah, king of Judah, wrote, and inserted in the Jehovistic recension of the Elohistie document, Deut. i.–xxxi. 13; 23–30; and xxxii. (xxxiii. was not perhaps written by the Deuteronomist), and gave the book of Joshua its present shape.

The view of Delitzsch, who likewise belongs to the school of the Supplementists, is peculiar.<sup>(1)</sup> He maintains that the author of the Elohistie sections composed these first, avoiding, or at least seldom using, the name Jehovah prior to Ex. vi. 2, where Jehovah declares that he was known to the fathers under the name of El Shaddai, which forms a connecting link between the name Elohim and that of Jehovah. These Elohistie sections are distinguished from the Jehovistic, not merely by the naming of God, but also by a variety of otherwise peculiar expressions. Guided by these two currents of the history and by the express statements of the Pentateuch, Delitzsch is led to the following view of the composition of the Mosaic books: The kernel or first foundation of the Pentateuch is the book of the Covenant, written by Moses himself and afterwards incorporated into the connected history of the legislation, where it now stands (Ex. xix.–xxiv.). The remaining laws given in the wilderness of Sinai, till the children of Israel reached the plains of Moab, were published orally by Moses, but were written down by the priests, whose duty it was to see to their preservation (Deut. xvii. 11; xxiv. 8; xxxiii. 10; Lev. x. 11; xv. 31). This codification of the Law, however, did not take place during the wandering in the Wilderness, but soon after the possession of Canaan. On the soil of the Holy Land the history of Israel began to be written; and the writing of the history of the Mosaic age rendered it necessary to give a complete account

<sup>(1)</sup> *Commentar über die Genesis*. 3rd ed., 1860.

of the Mosaic legislation. A man like Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, wrote the great work beginning with Gen. i. 1, into which he introduced the book of the Covenant, and perhaps gave only a short account of the last discourses of Moses, because Moses had recorded these with his own hand. Another, who may have been Joshua or one of those elders on whom the spirit of Moses rested, supplemented this work, taking Deuteronomy, which Moses had mainly written, for his model, and incorporating it into his own book. This theory of Delitzsch, with slight modifications, was adopted by Kurtz,<sup>(1)</sup> who formerly sided with Hengstenberg and his school in denying the composite character of the Pentateuch, but who had not written much of his history before he felt compelled to change his opinion. It is favored also by Perowne,<sup>(2)</sup> who sums up his inquiry in the following theses:

"1. The book of Genesis rests chiefly on documents much earlier than the time of Moses, though it was probably brought to very nearly its present shape either by Moses himself or by one of the elders who acted under him.

"2. The books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are to a great extent Mosaic. Besides those portions which are expressly declared to have been written by him, other portions, and especially the legal sections, were, if not actually written, in all probability dictated by him.

"3. Deuteronomy, excepting the concluding part, is entirely the work of Moses as it professes to be.

"4. It is not probable that this was written before the preceding books, because the legislation in Exodus and Leviticus as being the more formal is manifestly the earlier, whilst Deuteronomy is the spiritual interpretation and application of the Law. But the letter is always before the spirit; the thing before its interpretation.

"5. The first *composition* of the Pentateuch as a whole could

---

(1) *Geschichte des alten Bundes*, Bd. 2, 1855, § 99, 6.

(2) *Art. Pentateuch*, in *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*.



not have taken place till after the Israelites had entered Canaan. It is probable that Joshua, or the elders who were associated with him, would provide for its formal arrangement, custody, and transmission.

"6. The whole work did not finally assume its present shape till its revision was undertaken by Ezra after the return from the Babylonish captivity."

Thus far we have passed in review three different theories: the Documentary, the Fragmentary, and the Supplementary. The later critics not satisfied with any of these, and yet finding a measure of truth in all of them, have been driven to another theory, which, while more complicated, is supposed to do fuller justice to the known facts. They regard the Documentary Theory as true, so far as it affirms the composite character of the Pentateuch, but false in its mechanical view of the method pursued in its compilation. The Fragmentary Theory, they think, fails to perceive the manifest plan according to which the whole Pentateuch is arranged, but has caught a glimpse of the truth, that there are, here and there, fragments not organically connected with any of the historical documents which enter into the composition; as, for example, Gen. vi. 1-4, and Gen. xiv., which Ewald regards as a leaf from a hither-Asiatic history; and as to the Supplementary Theory, as presented by Bleek and his successors, they consider it untenable, because the supposed Jehovistic supplements are not supplements in fact, but parallel narratives, which, moreover, at many points, flatly contradict the Elohistical fundamental document; as in the two accounts of Creation, standing side by side, and in the interwoven narratives of the Flood. The correct theory, they think, must take up what is true in each of these earlier ones.

The first attempt to set this forth was made by Ewald (born Nov. 16, 1803, and died May 4, 1875). The Pentateuch and Joshua, which he names *the Great Book of Origins*, were, according to Ewald, the result of a process of stratification. We give

his view as modified in the second edition of his *History of the People of Israel*,<sup>(1)</sup> English translation, Vol. I., pp. 63-168.

The oldest deposit he finds in a comparatively small number of fragments belonging to a very early date. These fragments, however, which lie scattered from Genesis to Judges and display many linguistic peculiarities, were originally contained, not in one, but in several historical works, the oldest of which is the *Book of the Wars of the Lord* (Num. xxi. 14), a collection of the reminiscences of the victorious campaigns of Moses and Joshua. From these were derived the Song of Deliverance (Ex. xv. 1-18), the list of Stations (Num. xxxiii.), and Joshua's Speech (Josh. xvii. 14-18). Somewhat later, yet still in the first century after Moses, he finds traces of a *Biography of Moses*, which displays a hand more skilled in narrative composition, and presents Moses himself and his time in the clearest light; but unfortunately only Ex. iv. 18 and the whole of Ex. xviii. can be assigned to it with confidence. Of a third of these early historical works, many more fragments have been preserved; and these have one striking characteristic in common, inasmuch as they are mainly intent on showing how the ancient covenant arose. As they describe the covenants between Israel and Elohim (Ex. xxiv.), as well as those between Jacob and Laban, Isaac and Abimelech, Abraham and Abimelech (Gen. xxi. 22-32; xxvi. 28-31; xxxi. 44-54), the book from which they have been taken may fitly be called the *Book of Covenants*. The author, probably a member of the tribe of Judah, wrote in the second half of the period of the Judges. He was the first who united the history of the three patriarchs with that of Moses in one great work. He inserted the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 1-17) as well as a minute summary of the Mosaic laws (Ex. xxi. 2-xxiii. 19), which he must have received in written form

<sup>(1)</sup> *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*. The first edition of the first, second, and third volumes were published in 1843, 1845, and 1847; the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh volumes were added in the years 1852, 1855, 1858, and 1859. A second and enlarged edition of the first three volumes was put forth in 1851 and 1853, and a third, of Volumes I.-IV., in 1864-66.

from an earlier time, and incorporated songs, which have all the signs of great antiquity. Doubtless he made use of older written sources, and among these was, probably, the Book of the Wars of the Lord.

After these primitive histories comes an important work, of which many and extensive fragments have been preserved, and which Ewald names the *Book of Origins*, because it describes the origins of things,—of the nation of Israel as well as of its individual tribes and families, of the heroes of Israel as well as of its institutions and laws, of all nations of the earth as well as of the earth and heaven themselves. It is in fact a general history from an Israelite point of view. The principle according to which the historic matter is arranged is always first to dispose of those nations or families that do not lead down direct to Israel, that Israel may then at length come out as a special people, and the narrative there gain its highest attraction and greatest breadth. It attempts accurate time distinctions, and follows a definite chronology. But the interest of the author lay especially in the legislation of Israel, and in his book he gives an explanation of the laws existing in the Mosaic community. To him we owe not only the priestly legislation of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, but also the account of the origin and usages of circumcision and the laws of the Pass-over and of the first-born. The book was written in the first third of the reign of Solomon by a priest, who begins his history with the creation of the world (Gen. i.), and closes it with a short account of the erection of the Solomonic Temple (1 Kings viii. 1–11).

Next follow three prophetic narrators of the primitive histories, whom Ewald, counting the Book of Covenants the first narration and the Book of Origins the second, names the *Third*, *Fourth*, and *Fifth* narrators. The hand of the Third narrator, who probably made use of the Book of Covenants, is seen in various sections of Genesis (especially in the story of Joseph), of Exodus (the account of Moses' youth, Ex. i. 15–11, ii. 22; of the shining of his face, Ex. xxxiv. 30–35), and of Numbers

(the account of the seventy elders, and of Eldad and Medad, Num. xii. 6-8). He has a lofty conception of the working of the Divine Spirit, and frequently introduces into his narration the dream and its prophetic significance. His book was written in the tenth or ninth century, in the age of Elijah or Joel.

The Fourth narrator is intellectually the ablest of all. He is filled with the prophetic idea, and treats the history with all possible freedom. Consequently the historical distinctions of the various ages, observed by the Book of Origins, are dropped, and the ideas current in the author's age are transferred to the primitive times. From the first he names God Jehovah, and traces the origin of the worship of Jehovah to the Antediluvian Age (Gen. iv. 26). He composed his book at the close of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century.

The Fifth narrator, though he delineates some points anew with his own hand, is not so much an independent author as he is a compiler and elaborator. Generally he only either repeats word for word from older books, or slightly modifies the accounts of others. It is to him we owe the first great collection and working-up of all previous sources of the primitive history, and to him must be referred the existing Pentateuch with the book of Joshua, except Lev. xxvi. 3-45; Deut. i. 1-xxxii. 47; xxxiv. 10-12; and the Blessing of Moses, Deut. xxxiii. He bases his history on the Book of Origins, and confines himself to its chronological frame, and while working up his sources within this scheme, he sometimes transposes and sometimes omits; nor does he deem it necessary that there should be perfect uniformity in the matter inserted.

The Pentateuch received its present shape by the insertion, first, of Lev. xxvi. 3-45, written by a descendant of the exiled inhabitants of Israel, at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the seventh century; second, of Deut. i. 1-xxxii. 47; xxxiv. 10-12, written down during the second half of the reign of Manasseh, by some one living in Egypt and belonging to the tribe of Judah; third, of the Blessing of Moses, composed probably in the time of Josiah.

Such is the view of Ewald. We have given it somewhat more fully on account of his deserved reputation as a Biblical scholar and sagacious critic. Ewald holds a place in Old Testament science similar to that of Kant in philosophy; his opinions, however erroneous, cannot be ignored. The theory he propounds of the origin and composition of the Pentateuch is, indeed, needlessly complicated; it differs apparently very widely from that of other critics; but this difference is more apparent than real. It arises from the fact that he finds a distinct document in his Book of the Covenants. What others name the Fundamental Writing (*Grundschrift*) or First Elohist is substantially his Book of Origins; their Second Elohist is his Third narrator with part of the Book of Covenants; their Jehovist is his Fourth narrator with part of the Book of Covenants; and their Redactor is the Fifth narrator. In this respect there is general agreement with differences in detail.

Simpler is the view of Hupfeld (born March 31, 1796, at Marburg, and died April 24, 1866, at Halle), who in his *Sources of Genesis*<sup>(1)</sup> enters into a full and masterly discussion of the documents from which the first book of the Pentateuch was derived, and of the manner in which it was composed. This valuable work, which has influenced all later criticism, consists of two treatises:<sup>(2)</sup> the first, on *The Original Document of Genesis in its true Form*, in which he claims for the document a number of genuine passages hitherto overlooked, and excludes other passages which in his opinion belong to another document; the second, on *The later Constituent Parts of Genesis and the Procedure of the Redactor*. The conclusion that Hupfeld reaches is that Genesis rests upon three documents, each of which, originally independent of the others, was a continuous history. The oldest of these was the *Urschrift*, or writing of the First Elohist, whose history, beginning with the creation

(1) *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung von Neuem untersucht von Dr. Hermann Hupfeld.* Berlin, 1853.

(2) Originally published in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft*, from Jan. to July, 1853.

of the world, is characterized by the constant use of the divine name Elohim; by presenting the kingdom of God as progressing through several stages; by its simple view of revelation as given without the mediation of angels, dreams, visions; and by various peculiarities of language and style. The second document is the *Jehovistic*, which likewise begins with creation, but names God Jehovah. It is an independent history written without reference to the Elohistic, and does not therefore consist of supplements to an earlier document. There are indeed many gaps, but these are not original; they are due to omissions by the Redactor, who has reported the events from another document, and has consequently dropped them from this. The third document is that of the *Second Elohist*. It was originally a connected and complete history, occupying a middle place both as to time and character between the First Elohist and the Jehovist, and notwithstanding the use of the name Elohim, it stands nearer to the latter than to the former both in thought and expression. It was less extensive, however, than the other, for there is no trace of it before the patriarchal age. From these three documents the book of Genesis in its present shape was compiled by the Redactor, who in general adopts the language of his sources, though he does not hesitate to make changes, when necessary to form a connected and well-arranged narrative. His activity appears especially in the arrangement of his sources according to a definite plan, which sometimes leads to a displacement and transposition of parts; in the omission of that which as pure repetition would have been superfluous and disturbing; in the addition of glosses which serve to explain or conjoin portions of different documents; and in occasional alterations of one source by means of another.

Thus it will be seen that Hupfeld's is mainly an improvement of the old documentary theory as propounded by Ilgen, though wrought out independently of him; for Hupfeld assures us in his preface that he did not consult Ilgen's book till he had published his first three articles, and was preparing the fourth

for the press; and then he was not a little surprised to find that what he had regarded as discoveries made by himself had been in large measure anticipated by his predecessor, especially the distinction of the Elohist, which has been adopted by nearly all critics since.

In Vaihinger's theory,<sup>(1)</sup> which rests chiefly on Ewald, the idea of supplements occupies a more prominent place. The Pentateuch, in his opinion, originates from four sources: First, the *Pre-Elohist*, whose work is substantially Ewald's Book of the Covenants,—an independent history which first comes to view in Gen. xi. 29, 30, but which extended far beyond Moses' time. It dates from the twelfth century before Christ. Secondly, the *Elohist*, who wrote independently of the Pre-Elohist, and whose work, substantially Ewald's Book of Origins, belongs to the beginning of the tenth century before Christ. Thirdly, the *Jehovist*, who was not an independent narrator, but who, about the middle of the reign of Uzziah, in the first half of the eighth century, enlarged and supplemented the Pre-Elohist, partly by extracts from the Elohist and partly by additions of his own. The result of the Jehovist's work is the first four books of the Pentateuch, together with the closing part of Deuteronomy. Fourthly, the *Deuteronomist*, who in the reign of Hezekiah wrote our present book of Deuteronomy, except xxxii. 48–52, and xxxiv. Lastly, into this Jehovistic work the *Harmonist* inserted Deuteronomy, which was still separate in the reign of Josiah, and gave to the Pentateuch its present five-fold division. This Harmonist, who was not Ezra, but some prophet in the time of Jeremiah, possibly Jeremiah himself, exercised considerable freedom in editing the Pentateuch, adding, omitting, or transposing as the connection required.

According to Knobel also,<sup>(2)</sup> the Jehovist is only a supplementer. At the basis of the Pentateuch and Joshua lay the work of

(<sup>1</sup>) See his article *Pentateuch*, published in 1859, in Herzog's Real-Encyclopedia, 1st Ed., Vol. XI., pp. 292–370.

(<sup>2</sup>) *Kritik des Pentateuchs und Josua in the Exegetische Handbuch*, 1861.



the *Elohist*, a priest who wrote in the time of Saul in the southern part of the Kingdom. This work, which recorded the history from creation to the division of Canaan, and which is so peculiar in matter and form as to be easily detected from Genesis to Joshua, was edited and enlarged, in the last years of Hezekiah, by the *Jehovist* who probably belonged to the kingdom of Israel. For this purpose he employed two older sources: The *Law Book* (*Book of Jasher*, Josh. x, 13), written in the northern Kingdom, in the Assyrian age, which contained laws, narratives and poems; and the *War Book* (the *Book of the Wars of the Lord*, Num. xxi, 14) which seems to have been written, in the southern country by a Levite in the time of Jehoshaphat. The *Jehovist* has preserved the *Elohist*ic document, nearly complete, and has adhered as closely as possible to the language of his other sources; still where it seemed necessary to reconcile differences, he did not hesitate to transpose, abridge or add. This *Jehovistic* edition of the *Elohist* was further enlarged in the last years of the kingdom of Judah, probably in the time of Josiah, by the *Deuteronomist*, who inserted his discourses and laws, and revised the book of Joshua.

It is not necessary to do more than to name Davidson's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1862 and 1863) and Colenso's *Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua* (Part I, 1862, Parts II-V. 1863-1865), since neither contributed anything new to the theory of the composition of the Pentateuch.

But the view presented by Nöldeke in his *Old Testament Literature*<sup>(1)</sup> and his *Researches toward the Criticism of the Old Testament*,<sup>(2)</sup> has commanded wide attention. He finds the same sources—the Fundamental Document (*Grundschrift*), the (second) *Elohist*, the *Jehovist*, the *Deuteronomist*, and the *Redactor*—as Hupfeld and the other later critics; but he regards their relation and combination in a different light. The Fun-

(1) *Die alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt.*

(2) *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des alten Testaments*, Kiel, 1869.

damental Document, to which he has devoted a close examination in a very able treatise,<sup>(1)</sup> is a single systematic and homogeneous whole, written by a priest at Jerusalem in the 10th or 9th century before Christ. About the same time originated the remaining materials of the first four books of the Pentateuch. The work of the Jehovist, in which these materials are comprised, is of a composite character; for the Jehovist, the most talented of all the narrators, made large use of the (second) Elohist, borrowing from him whole sections, which he wove into his own narrative, often so closely that the two constituents of his book are not always distinguishable. About the year 800, the Redactor united the Fundamental Document and the work of the Jehovist, while still later, in the reign of Josiah, the Deuteronomist inserted his book and completely rewrought the Book of Joshua.

Closely allied to this is the view of Schrader in his edition of De Wette's *Introduction*.<sup>(2)</sup> He regards the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua as the product of four authors. The earliest is the *annalistic narrator* (the first Elohist or *Grundschrift* of other critics), a priest who, in the reign of David at Hebron, wrote a brief history extending from creation to the division of Canaan, in which he recorded the priestly legislation of the three middle books. Not long after he was followed by the *theocratic narrator* (the second Elohist of Hupfeld), who lived in the northern Kingdom, 975–950 B. C., and independently of the Annalist, wrote down the traditions of the people from a theocratic point of view. These two works were edited and united into a whole by the *prophetic narrator* (the Jehovist) a north Israelite and contemporary of Jeroboam II. 825–800 B. C., who added much to his written sources. Finally in this compilation of the prophetic narrator, the *Deu-*

(1) *Die so-genannte Grundtext*, in his *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1-144.

(2) *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung* von Wilhelm Martin Leber-echt de Wette. Neu bearbeitet von Dr. Eberhard Schrader. Achte durchgehends verbesserte, stark vermehrte und zum Theil gänzlich umgestaltete Ausgabe, 1869. See also Schrader's article *Pentateuch* in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, Band iv. 1872.

teronomist, soon after Josiah's, 622, inserted his own book which was written a few years earlier, and revised the entire Pentateuch and the book of Joshua.

Dillmann,<sup>(1)</sup> though he finds the same documents, conceives of their composition in a slightly different way. The *Record of Law* (the first Elohist or *Grundschrift*) and the *Israelite Book of Narrative* (the second Elohist) were written independently; but the *Judean Prophetic Book* (the Jehovist) rests to a great extent on the Israelite Book of Narrative from which it has borrowed large sections. These three works were united by the Redactor who, besides, made use of the Israelite Book of Narrative in its original form as well as in the form in which it had been worked up into the Judean Prophetic Book.

It will have been noticed by the attentive reader that all the later critics place that document, which contains the priestly legislation (Leviticus and the related laws in Exodus and Numbers), before the Jehovist and second Elohist, and assign to Deuteronomy the last place in the order of time. Hence the name—*first Elohist, Grundschrift, Urschrift* which the earlier document bears. It is necessary now to go back to the year 1866, when Graf published his celebrated work, *The Historical Books of the Old Testament*,<sup>(2)</sup> and introduced what has since been commonly called *Graf's Theory*. It differs from the current criticism chiefly in respect to the date of the Levitical legislation. While this has been and still is regarded by the majority of modern critics, as the kernel of the first Elohist document, as a part, therefore, of the foundation on which the Pentateuch rests, and as considerably older than the Deuteronomic legislation, the new theory with which we are now concerned reverses the relation, and assigns the legislation of the three middle books to the time of the second Temple.

This view, though named after Graf, did not originate with

(<sup>1</sup>) *Kurtzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum alten Testaments; Die Genesis*, 1875; *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, 1880.

(<sup>2</sup>) *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des alten Testaments*. Zwei historisch-kritischen Untersuchungen von Karl Heinrich Graf, 1866.

him. Its foundations were laid by Reuss, who predicted, as far back as 1833,<sup>(1)</sup> that it would become an integral part of the science of criticism to maintain the post—Deuteronomic origin of the ritual law. They were further strengthened by George<sup>(2)</sup> and Vatke.<sup>(3)</sup> It was Graf, however, who gave currency to the view by putting the question of the relation of the Deuteronomic to the Levitical legislation in a new shape and resting the discussion on a better basis.

His starting point is Deuteronomy, because the origin of that book in the reign of Joshua is regarded as certain by a large majority of the critics,<sup>(4)</sup> and he seeks to show what, on the one hand, is presupposed by the Deuteronomist, and what on the other, belongs to a later time. The basis of the Pentateuch and of the book of Joshua is a purely historical work, viz ; the so-called First Elohist of other critics, but without the priestly laws assigned to it by them. About the middle of the eighth century, or in the time of Ahaz, this was edited and supplemented by the Jehovist from sources partly written and partly oral. This book, as it came from the hand of the Jehovist, contained little legislation ; in fact, only Ex. xx-xxiii ; xxxiv. 10—27 ; xiii. 1—16. Accordingly, if we omit Deut-

(1) Art. *Judenthum* in Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopedie.

(2) *Die älteren jüdischen Feste mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuchs.* Berlin, 1835.

(3) *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, Berlin, 1835. The preface of George's book was written Oct. 12, that of Vatke's, Oct. 18 of the same year. Vatke only published Part First. Endowed with a mind of wonderful acumen, he anticipated the results of the most recent criticism, especially as set forth by Kuenen and Wellhausen ; and it would not be surprising if his book, in spite of its somewhat obscure Hegelian philosophy, should receive a more appreciative recognition in the future, than it has received in the past.

(4) As Graf's thesis is the post-Exilic origin of the Levitical laws, he constantly assumes much as having been proved by other scholars. He does not attempt, for example, to establish the late date of Deuteronomy, but simply refers to Riehm (*Die Gesetzgebung Moses im Lande Moab*, Gotha, 1854), and others, who have given special attention to this particular question.

i-xxx, the book of Leviticus and the post-Exilic passages in Exodus (xii. 1—28, 43—51; xxv—xxxi; xxxv—xl) and in Numbers (i. 1—x. 28; xv: xvi; xvii in part; xviii; xix: xxviii—xxxi; xxxv. 16—xxxvi. 13), together with a few additions in Genesis, we have the pre-Deuteronomic form of the Pentateuch.

Nearly a century and a half later, the Deuteronomist, whom Graf is inclined to identify with the prophet Jeremiah, wrote the book which was found in the eighteenth year of Josiah (2 Kgs. xxii), and which originally consisted of Deut. iv. 45—xxvi. 19, and xxviii. In chapters xii—xx, he freely reproduced and enlarged the older law-book (Ex. xx—xxiii) which the Jehovist had incorporated in his work; but the laws in chapters xxi—xxv, very few of which appear in Exodus, he seems to have taken from another collection of laws, supplementary to that of Exodus. In the time of Jehoiachin, the Deuteronomist inserted his law-book in the historical work of the Jehovist, which he also revised, connecting his book with the preceding history by chaps. i—iv, recasting and interpolating the Jehovistic piece, chapter xxvii, and adding chapters xxix and xxx.

But the Levitical legislation was, according to Graf unknown to the Deuteronomist, and betrays the most manifest signs of a post-Exilic origin. This he endeavored to prove by an examination of the laws relating to the feasts, the priests, the tithes, the first-born, the tabernacle, and other matters,—laws which were never observed in the history before the Exile, and which had no existence for the Deuteronomist, or were at least ignored by him. And in further confirmation he points to certain external testimonies, as Am. v. 25, which presupposes that during the journey through the Wilderness no sacrifices were brought to Jehovah, and knows nothing, therefore, of the tabernacle, as the center of the worship commanded in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers; Jer. vii. 22 sq., which says that God in the time of the exodus from Egypt gave no laws concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices; Ezek. xl—xlvi, which

enjoins a multitude of precepts concerning worship and the rights and duties of the priests, though without apparent motive, if all this was already more fully recorded in the Pentateuch.

The Levitical legislation, according to Graf, originated with Ezekiel, who published Lev. xviii—xxvi; it was developed in the time of Ezra and perhaps by Ezra himself, who supplemented Ezekiel's book by adding Ex. xii. 1—28; 43—51; xxv—xxx; xxxv—xl; Lev. i—xvi; xxiv. 10—23; Num. i. 48—x. 28; xv—xix; xxviii—xxx; xxxv. 16—xxxvi. 13; and it reached its conclusion soon after Ezra, when Ex. xxx. 11 seqq.; Lev. xxvii, and perhaps Ex. xxxvi. 8—xxxviii. 20 were added.

Soon after the publication of this book, Graf found it necessary, in consequence of the criticism to which it was subjected by Kuenen and Riehm, to modify his view at two points. He had assumed, in accordance with the current opinion and without special investigation on his own part, that the Jehovist was a mere supplementer of the Elohist history; but after a close study of Hupfeld's *Sources of Genesis* and Nöldeke's *Investigations*, to which he had hitherto given little attention, he became convinced that the Jehovist was an independent writer, who made extensive use of the narrative of another independent writer,—the so-called second Elohist.

Of more importance for his theory was his second modification. He had split the *Grundschrift* of other critics into two parts; the smaller historical half he regarded with them as the oldest portion of the Pentateuch; but the larger, legislative half, containing the Levitical laws of the middle books, he held, in opposition to other critics, to be the latest portion, dating mainly from the time of Ezra, though partly before and partly after. But it was not difficult to show that the legislative half is inseparable from the historical half. They are identical in conception and language, and it is simply impossible to place an interval of centuries between them. The same hand that wrote or edited the priestly Elohist law must

also have written the priestly Elohist history. This became apparent to Graf at once when it was brought to his earnest attention; and it was necessary for him now either to give up his theory that the Levitical law is post-Exilic, or to maintain that the priestly Elohist history is likewise post-Exilic. He chose the latter alternative and gave expression to his change of opinion as early as November, 1866, in a private letter to Kuenen,<sup>(1)</sup> and later in a public way in an article published in 1869.<sup>(2)</sup>

At first Graf's theory was not received with much favor. It was too radical, too antagonistic to current critical opinion, to find general acceptance. If adopted, it would necessitate the reconstruction of the entire history of Israel, for it places that last which had always been held to be first. And so the critics were prejudiced against it from the beginning, regarding it as a passing fancy, too absurd to be seriously noticed.

Riehm, however, gave it a searching criticism in 1868.<sup>(3)</sup> He acknowledges, indeed, that, while in the time of the second Temple, the Levitical legislation was in full force, the pre-Exilic history affords very few testimonies to its existence and presupposes manifold relations and circumstances not in agreement with it. This, it is true, creates a difficulty for the usual view,—a difficulty which Graf's theory removes, but only, in Riehm's opinion, by creating new and greater difficulties. He strikes at the very heart of the theory by endeavoring to prove an undeniable acquaintance of the Deuteronomist, not only with the laws in Ex. xiii; xx—xxiii; and xxxiv, but also with the Levitical legislation, which Graf maintains is post-Deuteronomic. Besides this, he seeks to show that Graf's view can not satisfactorily explain the historical origin of the laws of

(1) See Bleek's *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, Vierte Auflage, p. 160. The editor Wellhausen, gives the later history of Pentateuch criticism to which we acknowledge our indebtedness.

(2) *Die sogenannte Grundschrift des Pentateuchs in Merx's Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten Testaments*, pp. 466-477.

(3) In the *Studien und Kritiken*, for 1863, pp. 350-379.



the Levitical worship from the circumstances of the Exilic and post-Exilic age; and that it is not borne out by a correct interpretation of the testimonies adduced from Amos, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

This critique forced Graf, as we have seen, to assign the priestly history of the Elohist, as he had already assigned the priestly legislation, to the time of the second Temple. Such an inversion seemed to Riehm at first absolutely inconceivable; he could not think that the Jehovist was prior to the Elohist; but when he found that this was asserted by Nöldeke as a possibility and by de Lagarde as a fact, he wrote a second article<sup>(1)</sup> in which he gave seven arguments, drawn from the language, the character of the narrative, the contents, &c., to prove that the Elohist history is earlier than the Jehovistic.

But while the large majority of critics regarded Graf's theory as untenable, there were some who gave it a favorable reception. Kuenen (Prof. at Leyden) thought he found in it the key to the solution of difficulties he had for years been feeling. Already in 1861 he expressed the opinion<sup>(2)</sup> that the Elohist laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers did not originate at one period, but successively, within the priestly circle, whose traditions and ideas they contain; that they were repeatedly worked up and re-edited from the time of Solomon on, the final redaction being later than the time of Josiah; and due, therefore, not to the Deuteronomist, but rather to one of the Jerusalem priests. In 1862 appeared the first part of Colenso's *Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua* in which the English bishop critically examines the Pentateuch narratives and endeavors to demonstrate their unhistorical character. The reading of this book led Kuenen a step further. He found that nearly all the difficulties, at which Colenso stumbled belong to the so-called *Grundschrift*, the supposed earlier Elohist document; and

---

<sup>(1)</sup> *Die so-genannte Grundschrift des Pentateuchs*, Studien und Kritiken, 1872, pp. 283-307.

<sup>(2)</sup> In his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, Part First, 1861.

this was all the more remarkable, since Colenso at that time made no distinction of sources. Now, concluded Kuenen, if that document is the oldest in the Pentateuch, it must certainly be the most trustworthy; but if it is not to be relied upon as history, it must be of late origin. Thus on the publication of Graf's book, he was fully prepared to adopt its theory as to the Levitical legislation, and was in a position at the same time to see and correct what he regarded as its fatal mistake, viz., the violent and unnatural sundering of the priestly Elohist history from the priestly Elohist legislation. On this latter point he, in private correspondence, stated his objections to Graf, who saw their force and set himself to remedy the error. "Since then," says Kuenen,<sup>(1)</sup> "by further study and by the excellent work of K. H. Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des alten Testaments*, I have been led to the conviction, that the priestly legislation in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers was not brought to its present form until after the Exile, and therefore in its entirety is younger than Deuteronomy. But this opinion is not opposed to my earlier hypothesis as to the successive origination of that legislation, and must be combined with it. The decrees of the priestly law were not *made* and *invented* during or after the Exile, but *drawn up*. Prior to the Exile the priests had already delivered verbally what—with the modifications that had become necessary in the meantime—they afterward committed to writing. A set terminology, a definite mode of expression, gradually formed itself for these instructions. (Com. Graf. l. c. p. 93). The committal to writing of the priestly thorah, also, will not have been deferred until the period of the second Temple, or even till the days of Ezra. It is true there did not exist before that time any complete system of priestly lawgiving; but detached priestly laws, priestly advice upon this or that sub-division of the question that belonged to the domain of the staff of the second Temple, cannot have been wanting." Since his adop-

---

(<sup>1</sup>) *The Religion of Israel*, Vol. II. p. 96, Eng. translation.

tion of Graf's theory, which took place at the time of its publication, Kuenen has been working in its interest, and it is on its basis that his *History of the Religion of Israel* (1870) is constructed.

In 1874 Kayser, a scholar of the veteran Reuss, wrote his treatise entitled, *The Pre-Exilic Book of the Primitive History of Israel and its Enlargements*.<sup>(1)</sup> His aim is to ascertain the relative age of the several elements that constitute the Pentateuch, and the conclusion he reaches, from a study of the citations and allusions in the other books of the Old Testament, is that the pre-Exilic book, apart from Deuteronomy composed in the reign of Josiah, consisted exclusively of the Jehovistic narrative and legislation, and that the remaining portions, including the (first) Elohistie history are of Exilic or post-Exilic origin.

Perhaps the ablest advocate of Graf's theory at the present time, is Wellhausen (Prof. in Griefswald), a man of extraordinary tact for criticism, both textual<sup>(2)</sup> and literary. No other has presented it in a clearer and more forcible manner. He was led to its adoption in a singular way. In the beginning of his Old Testament studies, as he tells us,<sup>(3)</sup> he devoted himself to the historical and prophetic books, to the narratives concerning Saul and David, Elijah and Ahab, and to the noble discourses of Amos and Isaiah. But his conscience reproved him as having begun at the roof, rather than at the foundation; for as yet he knew not the law, which he was told, was the foundation and presupposition of the remaining literature of the Old Testament. So he summoned courage and worked his way through Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. But

---

(1) *Das vor-exilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen, Ein Beitrag zur Pentateuch-Kritik von August Kayser, Prof. in Strassburg, 1874.*

(2) His ability as a textual critic is strikingly displayed in his *Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht von Lic. Julius Wellhausen, Privatdoc, der Theol. in Göttingen, 1871.*

(3) *Geschichte Israels*, pp. 3, 4.

he waited in vain for the light that was to break forth from this source over the historical and prophetic books. His enjoyment of these was destroyed by his study of the Law. Where there were points of contact, there were at the same time broad differences, and he could not see that the Law represented the earlier stage of religious development. In an obscure way he perceived that a wide chasm stood between the two worlds; he became confused and perplexed, until in the summer of 1867, when, on a visit to Göttingen, he heard that Graf assigned the Levitical law a place after the prophets; and then, almost before he heard the proofs of his hypothesis, he became a convert to it, and dared to confess that Hebrew antiquity could be understood without the book of the Law.

In 1876 and 1877 he published his three essays on *The Composition of the Hexateuch*,<sup>(1)</sup> in which he sets forth his analysis of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua into their component elements. We give his theory in as brief a form as possible.

The Hexateuch is made up of three distinct formations, each of which forms a separable whole and represents a particular stage of development in the history of Israel. The first is the *Jehovistic Book of History*, which he designates J E. It is almost entirely historical, including no other legislation than that contained in Ex. xx—xxiii. and xxxiv. It is itself a compilation from two independent documents, viz., the Jahvist (J), and the (second) Elohist (E), and the matter borrowed from these sources constitutes the main body of the narrative. The two documents, J and E, are nearly allied and run parallel to each other, yet each has peculiarities of conception and language, by means of which they can here and there be

---

(1) In the *Jahrbucher für Deutsche Theologie*. The first, giving his analysis of Genesis in the Vol. for 1876, pp. 392-450; the second, the analysis of the historical narratives of the remaining books of the Hexateuch, in the same Vol. pp. 532-602; and the third, the analysis of the collections of laws of the Pentateuch in respect to their internal structure and their connection with the history, in the Vol. for 1877, pp. 407-479.

readably distinguished. In general, however, they are so closely welded together, that it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to sunder them. This first formation is the product of the pre-Assyrian age, the religious ideas of which it reflects.

The *second formation* lies before us in Deuteronomy i—xxxi (Dt. which passed through three stages before it reached its present form and relations. Originally it was simply a law-book, consisting of chs. xxii—xxvi. In the second stage, two independent and enlarged editions of this law-book, the original Deuteronomy, were issued, of which the first contained chs. i.—iv., xii.—xxvi., and xxvii., and the second, chs. v.—xi., xii.—xxvi. and xxviii.—xxx. In the third stage, these two editions were united, resulting in chs. i.—xxx., and inserted in the Jehovistic Book of History, being joined at the close by means of ch. xxxi. At the same time, the editor, who gave us Deuteronomy in its present shape, revised the Jehovistic Book of History from the Deuteronomic standpoint, making changes here and there, fewest in Genesis, more in Exodus and Numbers, most in Joshua. This second formation embodies the prophetic ideas of the post-Assyrian age in the time of Josiah.

Besides J E and Dt. we have a *third formation* in an independent historical and legislative work, viz. : the *Priests' Codex* (P C), the so-called *Grundschrift*. Its basis is the *Book of the Four Covenants* (Q), which presents the laws in a rigid historical frame-work, and loves to clothe them in an historical garb. In Genesis it appears nearly in its original form, but elsewhere it has been extensively enlarged by the labors of an entire school. The *Priests' Codex* is the product of the religious development from Ezekiel to Ezra and somewhat later. It was combined with J E and Dt. by a Redactor (R), who proceeds from its conceptions and employs its expressions.

Such, in broad outlines, are the results reached by the latest and, in many respects, the ablest of the many critics Germany has produced. Wellhausen's *History of Israel*,<sup>1</sup> written on the

(<sup>1</sup>) *Geschichte Israels* von J. Wellhausen. Erster Band, Berlin, 1878. This first volume is occupied exclusively with a criticism of the sources; the second volume, which has not yet appeared, will contain the history itself.

basis of this critical theory, has created a profound impression in theological circles, and will probably exert a very wide influence in the future. Even Delitzsch is constrained to acknowledge that it is "the most important work written from the point of view of the anti-supernaturalistic critics of the Old Testament, and in the Biblical field has won a power over men's minds comparable to the influence exerted in the philosophical field by Hartmann's *Philosophy of the Unconscious*."

#### IV. PRESENT STATE.

We have thus passed in review the several theories which have been entertained by a large number of critics, "many of them," as Westcott remarks, of undoubted piety as well as learning, who have found themselves compelled, after careful investigation, to abandon the older doctrine of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and to adopt, in some form or other, the theory of a compilation from earlier documents." We have yet to cast a glance around us, and to inquire, what is the present state of the Pentateuch controversy? An adequate treatment of this topic would require much space; all that we can now do is to take a hasty survey of the field.

The traditional opinion concerning the origin of the Mosaic books has always in the past had strong defenders among men renowned for their Biblical scholarship; and in spite of the fierce attacks it has had to bear, especially during the past century, it still has many and able advocates who boldly maintain that the unity of design apparent in the Pentateuch can only be satisfactorily explained on the supposition of a single author, and that this author could have been no other than Moses. They agree among themselves in denying the composite character of the work; and while some are ready to concede that Moses employed older sources in writing the Book of Genesis, they all set themselves in defiance against every theory of documents. Their number varies greatly in different countries. It must be frankly acknowledged, however it may be deplored,

that the traditional view finds least support where Biblical science is most cultivated. Its adherents are most numerous among English-speaking peoples, though even here it is set aside by such works as the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, which may be fairly said to represent the best English scholarship of the age. In Germany, Holland, France, and elsewhere on the continent, its advocates are few, even among those theologians who are esteemed most orthodox. In Germany Keil stands almost alone to-day as an uncompromising traditionalist among scholars of acknowledged authority; Lunge, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, expresses himself as dependent neither "on tradition and the orthodox rule, that it is not necessary for the belief of the canonical Word of God to attribute to Moses all the five books of Moses in the present form (except the report of his death), nor on the critical conjectures which, in various ways, through their false suppositions, their want of intelligence of the more profound relations of the word, and their great divergence from each other, prove themselves unripe efforts;"<sup>1</sup> and while he opposes the theory of documents in a feeble, half-hearted way, he allows his son-in-law, Fay, to write the *Commentary on the Book of Joshua* on the basis of that theory.<sup>2</sup>

On what grounds does the traditional view rest its defense against the assaults of modern criticism? The positive proof of the Mosaic authorship has always been the same. It is partly *direct*, and as such drawn (1) from the testimony of the Pentateuch itself; (2) from the testimony of the other books of the Old Testament; and (3) from the testimony of tradition in the Jewish synagogue and the Christian church; partly *indirect*, and as such drawn (1) from traces of the Pentateuch in other books of the Old Testament; (2) from various archaisms in the Pentateuch, (3) from the presence of Egyptian

(1) *Genesis*. Eng. translation, p. 94.

(2) Fay says: "As for our own view, we cannot, especially after the example of Bleek, avoid giving in our own adherence to the Supplement-hypothesis." Eng. Trans., p. 14.



words; and (4) from traces of a residence in Egypt and the Wilderness.<sup>(1)</sup> But it is more important to know how the objections alleged against the literary unity and Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch have been met and answered. The line of defense marked out by Ranke,<sup>(2)</sup> Hengstenberg,<sup>(3)</sup> Drechsler,<sup>(4)</sup> and Hävernick,<sup>(5)</sup> the ablest champions of traditional opinion, is still maintained by their legitimate successor, Keil, in his valuable *Introduction to the Old Testament*.<sup>(6)</sup> It consists partly in denying the alleged facts, and partly in putting upon them a different and often ingenious explanation.

One of the most perplexing difficulties is the remarkable occurrence of the Divine names, Elohim and Jehovah, in groups throughout Genesis up to Exodus vi., where the origin of the name Jehovah is recorded. This fact, noticed already by the early Church Fathers, is too palpable to admit of question. But how is it to be accounted for on the assumption of a single author? Sack in 1821 published an essay on this subject,<sup>(7)</sup> in which he contends that the interchange is necessary on account

---

(1) The positive argument for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch has been often ably presented; as, to name only modern works, in Keil's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Vol. I.; the introduction to the *Pentateuch* in The Speaker's Commentary; and the American additions to the Art. *Pentateuch* in Smith's Dict. of the Bible. Those who wish to see the best that can be said in a discussion of the Pentateuch question from the traditional standpoint are referred to Harman's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, third edition, revised, 1880.

(2) *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch aus dem Gebiete der höheren Kritik* Zwei Bände, 1834-1840.

(3) *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das alte Testament*. Bd. ii. und iii.; *Die Authentie des Pentateuchs*. Zwei Bände, 1836, 1839.

(4) *Die Einheit und Echtheit der Genesis*, 1838.

(5) *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, 1837.

(6) The second edition, published Dec. 1868, has been translated into English by Prof. George C. M. Douglass.

(7) *De usu nominum Dei יהוה et אלהים in libro Geneseos*.

of the internal difference of ideas expressed by the words.<sup>(1)</sup> Hengstenberg, who devotes a large part of his *Contributions* to the discussion of this question, has recourse to a special design on the part of Moses in the use now of the one name, and now of the other. But when it was seen that this surprising fact does not hold good beyond Exodus vi.; that both names are used under precisely the same circumstances and where no difference of design could be detected, as, *e. g.*, "Thus did Noah; according to all that *Elohim* commanded him, so did he," (Gen. vi. 22), and again, "And Noah did according to all that *Jehovah* commanded him," (Gen. vii. 5); and further, that the Elohist sections are characterized by peculiarities of language and manner never found in the Jehovistic sections;—it is not strange that even the advocates of the Mosaic authorship should regard this explanation as arbitrary, or at least unsatisfactory. And so "Drechsler modified his view, and supposed that the several uses of the Divine names were owing to a didactic purpose on the part of the writer, according as his object was to show a particular relation of God to the world, whether as *Elohim* or as *Jehovah*. Hence he argued that, whilst different streams flowed through the Pentateuch, they were not from two different fountain-heads, but varied according to the motive which influenced the writer, and according to the fundamental thought in particular sections; and on this ground, too, he explained the characteristic phraseology which distinguishes such sections;"<sup>(2)</sup> and now Keil himself, without despairing of the solution of the problem, confesses that "all attempts as yet made, notwithstanding the acumen which has been brought to bear to explain the interchange of the Divine names in Genesis

---

(1) "*Nos varietatem nominum Dei quandam in hisce scriptis necessarium fuisse contendimus propter notionum verbis expressarum internam differentiam. Scriptores, quibus revelationem quandam Dei se habere vel promulgare persuasum est, duplex Dei nomen proferre debent, alterum, quo generalis deitatis notio vel idea innuitur, alterum, quo illa virtus, qua Deus ipsis vel partibus se manifestavit, significatur.*"

(2) *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. III., pp. 2411 & 2412.

on the ground of the different meanings which they possess, must be pronounced a failure."

Another difficulty that confronts the upholder of the single authorship of the Pentateuch is the supposed presence of duplicate narratives, which, it is affirmed, are found throughout the five books; take, as an example, the first instance that occurs, viz., the double account of creation, as given, *first*, in Gen. ii. 11, 3, and *secondly*, in Gen. ii. 4-25. In the first, say the critics, creation takes place in six days, vegetation appearing on the third, animal life on the fifth, and man on the sixth; whereas in the second, man comes first, then vegetation, then the animals, and finally woman. There is a difference here, we are told, not only in the naming of God, and in the language and style, but also in the whole mode of conception and in the chronological order,—a difference that forbids the supposition that both accounts proceed from the same hand. But the advocates of the Mosaic authorship deny the existence of duplicate narratives, and, in this particular case, maintain that the account of Gen. ii. is only a supplement to that in Gen. i., though they differ among themselves greatly in their manner of reconciling the apparent discrepancy.

And so as regards the many alleged contradictions in the history and the laws; they are not admitted to be contradictions in fact, and are variously explained, with more or less ingenuity, in consistency with the theory that the Pentateuch has proceeded from a single hand.

Few, however, occupy the extreme position of Keil, who is unwilling to make any concessions whatever to modern criticism, and endeavors, often in an arbitrary manner, to explain away the post-Mosaic passages. This point the most conservative are to-day ready to yield. Thus Lange, whose Commentary is so widely used, says: "That one must adopt a canonical recension of the originals of Moses (i. e., a recension falling within the prophetic sphere of the Old Covenant), appears from the manifold indications of criticism. To these indications belongs, above all, the account of the death of Moses; the judg-

ments on Moses, however, as of a third person, which is the object of the statement Ex. xi. 3; Num. xii. 3, seem to us to decide nothing. Then there is the chasm of 38 years in the history of the wanderings of Israel through the desert (Num. xx.), as also other enigmatical obscurities (*see* Vaihinger). Farther, the manifold indications of the combination of various originals in initial and concluding formulas; the marks of a later period (Gen. xii. 6; xiii. 7; xiv. 14; xxiii. 2, at that time the Canaanites were in the land; Dan, Hebron, seem no conclusive characteristics); the presumption of a book of the war of Jehovah (Num. xxi. 14); the great development of the genealogy of Edom carried even to the appearance of its kings (Gen. xxxv. 11). The ambiguity of the expression 'unto this day' (Gen. xix. 37; xxii. 14, ff.), is also noticed by Vaihinger."<sup>(1)</sup>

Equally significant are the admissions of the Bishop of Ely in the *Speaker's Commentary*: "Let it only be understood, *in limine*, that this authorship thus claimed for Moses is not inconsistent with certain admissions.

"(a) For instance, it is not necessary to insist that every word of the Pentateuch was written down by the hand of Moses in his own autograph. He may have dictated much, or all of it, to Joshua, or to some secretary or scribe. He may have merely superintended its writing, and stamped it with his own authority, as perhaps St. Peter did the Gospel according to St. Mark. This may explain (though it is not necessary to assume this in order to explain) the fact, that Moses is always spoken of in the third person. This may explain also some things said concerning Moses, which he might have allowed others to write, but would not have been likely to write himself. This may explain the difficulty, if difficulty indeed it be, that the last chapter of Deuteronomy relates to the death of Moses; for what more likely, than that he, who wrote at Moses' dictation the acts and words of Moses, should have finished the work by recording Moses' death?

---

(<sup>1</sup>) *Genesis*, Eng. trans. p. 94.

“(b) It is not necessary to deny, that the Pentateuch, though the work of the great Prophet and Lawgiver whose name it bears, may have undergone some recension in after times, as by Ezra or others. The Jews hold that all the books of the Old Testament were submitted to a careful review by Ezra and the Great Synagogue (Buxtorf, ‘Tiberias,’ Lib. I. c. 10); and the fathers of the Church generally believed in such supervision. ‘Omne instrumentum Judaicæ literaturæ per Esdram constat restauratum.’ (Tertull., ‘De Cultu Femin.’ c. 3.) ‘Sive mo- sen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Esdram instauratorem operis, non recuso.’ (Hieron. ‘ad Helvideum,’ edit. Vall. Tom. II. p. 212). If Ezra collated MSS. and carefully edited the books of Moses, it is not impossible and is not inconsistent with the original authorship, that he should have admitted explanatory notes, which some think (rightly or wrongly) to betray a post-Mosaic hand.

“(c) It is not necessary to deny that Moses had certain documents or traditions referring to the patriarchal ages, which he incorporated into his history. Indeed, it is most likely that such traditions should have come down through Shem and Abraham to Joseph and the Israelites in Egypt; and there can be no reason why an inspired historian should not have worked up such trustworthy materials into the history of the ancestors of his people.<sup>(1)</sup>”

But even with these concessions it becomes more and more difficult to hold men to the traditional opinion. Kurtz, as we have seen, abandoned it and adopted the Supplementary Hypothesis. The critical theory of documents in one or other of its several forms, is gaining converts rapidly, and is much more widely entertained than is commonly supposed.

There are certain points on which its advocates are, at the present time, nearly of one mind. *First*, they assume it as demonstrated that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua belong together, and were compiled from several independent

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Vol. I. *The Pentateuch*, p. 2.

documents, written at different stages of the history of Israel, and from different points of view. This, they affirm, needs no longer to be proved, or if proof be demanded, it is found in the fact that the component elements of the Hexateuch can be successfully sundered from their present connections and recombined into their original organic wholes. There are, indeed, differences in detail, but, it must be admitted, that, in the main, the critics are in wonderful agreement.

*Secondly*, they are unanimous in asserting that four different independent writings, variously named, are discoverable in our present Hexateuch: viz. 1, the *Fundamental Writing* (the *Grundschrift*, First Elohist, Book of Origins, Annalistic Narrator, Book of the Four Covenants); 2, the Second Elohist (Third Narrator, Theocratic Narrator, Elohist); 3, the *Jehovist* (Fourth Narrator, Prophetic Narrator, Jahvist); and 4, the *Deuteronomist*. These several documents they characterize in the same way and reconstruct from pretty much the same materials.

*Thirdly*, they agree in regarding the Second Elohist and the Jehovist as much more closely related to each other both in character and in time, than to the First Elohist, on the one hand, or to the Deuteronomist on the other; as much more difficult to separate into their component parts; and as prior in time to the Deuteronomist, whom they place in the reign of Josiah or immediately before.

*Fourthly*, they generally acknowledge a Deuteronomic recension of the earlier Jehovistic history, and especially of the Book of Joshua, which in distinction from Judges, Samuel and Kings, Wellhausen regards as an appendix to the Pentateuch, presupposing it at all points, though not composed of just the same materials brought up in the same way.<sup>(1)</sup>

---

(1) *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, Bd. 21, p. 58. The Deuteronomic recension of the Book of Joshua has called forth a valuable Essay by Hollenberg, *Die Deuteronomische Bestandtheile des Buches Josua*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, pp. 462-506.

Fifthly, there is a surprising harmony among the critics as regards the so-called *Grundschrift*. This will be apparent from the following tables taken from late critics who are regarded as among the ablest:—

#### HUFFELD:

*Genesis.* i-ii. 3; v (except v 29); vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 11, 13-16\*, 17-22, 24; viii. 1-6 (except an interpolation in v. 4), 8-19; ix. 1-17, 28, 29; xi. 10-26, 27-32 (properly only va. 27, 31, 32); xii. 4<sup>b</sup>, 5; xiii. 6, 11<sup>b</sup>, 12<sup>a</sup>; xvi. 3, 15, 16; xvii.; xix. 29; xxi. 2-5; xxiii.; xxv. 7-10, 11, 12, 16<sup>b</sup>, 17, 19, 20, 21<sup>b</sup>, 26<sup>b</sup>; xxvi. 34, 35; xxviii. 1-9; xxxi. 17, 18; xxxv. 9-15, 27-29; xxxvi. 1-8, 9-43; xxxvii. 1; xlv. 6, 7; xlvii. 27, 28; xlviii. 3-6; xlix. 29-33; l. 12, 13, 22.

#### NÖLDEKE:

*Genesis.* i-ii. 4<sup>a</sup>; v. 1-28, 30-32; vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 11, 13-16\*, 18-22, 24; viii. 1, 2<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>b</sup>-5, 13<sup>a</sup>, 14-19; ix. 1-17 (18, 19<sup>a</sup>), 28, 29; x. 1-7, 13-20, 22-32; xi. 10-32; xii. 4<sup>b</sup>, 5; xiii. 6, 11<sup>b</sup>, 12 partly; xvi. 1, 3, 15, 16; xvii.; xix. 29; xxi. 2-5; xxii. 20-24; xxiii.; xxv. 1-20, 26<sup>b</sup>; xxvi. 34, 35; xxvii. 46; xxviii. 1-9; xxxi. 18; xxxv. 9-16<sup>a</sup>, 19, 20, 22<sup>b</sup>-29; xxxvi. 1-19 (20-39<sup>a</sup>); xxxvii. 1, 2 partly; xlv. 6-27; xlvii. 7-11, 27, 28; xlviii. 2 partly, 3-7; xlix. 29-33; l. 12, 13.

*Exodus.* i. 1-5, 7, 13, 14; ii. 23 partly, 24, 25; vi. 2-13, 16-30; vii. 1-13, 19, 20 partly, 22; viii. 1-3, 11 partly, 12-15; ix. 8-12; xi. 9, 10; xii. 1-23, 28, 37<sup>a</sup>, 40-51; xiii. 1, 2, 20; xiv. 1-4, 8, 9, 10 partly, 15-18, 21 partly, 22, 23, 26, 27 partly, 28, 29; xv. 22, 23 (partly<sup>a</sup>), 27; xvi. (in which are several later additions); xvii.; xix. 2<sup>a</sup>; xxiv. 15-18<sup>a</sup>; xxv. 1-xxx. 17; xxxv-xl.

*Leviticus.* i. 1-xxvi. 2 (with several additions, as xx. 24; xxv. 19-22); xxvi. 46; xxvii.

*Numbers.* i. 1-viii. 22; ix. 1-x 28; xiii. 1-17<sup>a</sup>, 21, 25, 26 partly, 32 partly; xiv. 1-10 (with later additions), 26-38 (with later additions); xv; xvi. 1<sup>a</sup>, 2 partly, 3-11, 16-22, 23, 24 partly, 26 partly, 27 partly, 35; xvii.; xviii.; xix; xx. 1 partly, 2-13 (with additions and other changes), 22-29; xxi. 4 partly, 10, 11; xxii. 1; xxv. 1-5 (much altered), 6-19; xxvi. 1-9<sup>a</sup>, 12-58, 59 partly, 60-66; xxvii.; (xxx. 2-17<sup>a</sup>); xxxi.; xxxii. 2, (3<sup>a</sup>), 4-6, 16-32, 33 partly, 40; xxxiii. 1-39, 41-51, 54; xxxiv.; xxxv.; xxxvi.

*Deuteronomy.* xxxii. 48-51 (52<sup>a</sup>); xxxiv. 1-3, 5-9. Besides much in the Book of Joshua.

#### KAYSER: (*Passages marked with an asterisk are doubtful.*)

*Genesis.* i. 1-ii. 3; v. (except v. 29), vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 11, 13-16\*, 18-22, 24; viii. 1, 2<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>b</sup>-5, 13<sup>a</sup>, 14-19; ix. 1-17, 28, 29; xi. 10-32; xii. 4<sup>b</sup>, 5; xiii. 6, 11<sup>b</sup>, 12<sup>a</sup>; xvi. 3, 15, 16; xvii.; xix. 29; xxi. 1<sup>b</sup>, 2-5; xxii. 20-24<sup>a</sup>; xxiii.; xxv. 7-11, 16<sup>b</sup>, 17, 19, 20, 26<sup>b</sup>-34; xxvi. 34, 35; xxvii. 46; xxviii. 1-9; xxxi. 17, 18; xxxiii. 18<sup>a</sup>; xxxv. 6<sup>a</sup>, 9-15, 22<sup>b</sup>-29; xxxvi. 1-8 (except 6<sup>a</sup>); xxxvii. 1; xlv. 6, 7; xlvii. 7-10, 27<sup>b</sup>, 28; xlviii. 3-6, 7<sup>a</sup>; xlix. 28<sup>b</sup>, 29-33; l. 12, 13, 22<sup>a</sup>.



*Exodus.* i. 7, 13, 14; ii. 23<sup>b</sup>-25; vi. 2-12; vii. 1-13, 19, 20<sup>a</sup>, 22; viii. 1-3, 12-15; ix. 8-12, 35; x. 20; xi. 9, 10; xii. 1-10, 14-20, 28, 40-51; xiii. 1-2; xiv. 1-4, 8, 9, 15<sup>b</sup>, 16<sup>b</sup>-18, 21-23, 26-29 (except 27<sup>b</sup>); xvi. 1-3, 6, 7a, 8-18; (except 15<sup>a</sup>), 21, 22<sup>b</sup>, 23, 32-34; xviii. 1; xxiv. 15-18<sup>a</sup>; xxv-xxxi, 17; xxxv-xl.

*Leviticus.* i-xvi; xvii. 2-7<sup>b</sup> (except 5<sup>a</sup>, 7<sup>a</sup>); xxi. 6<sup>b</sup>, 10<sup>b</sup>, 12<sup>b</sup>, 16-23<sup>a</sup>; xxii. 3-7, 10-14, 17-28; xxiii. 4-8, 14<sup>b</sup>, 15<sup>a</sup>, 16<sup>a</sup>, 21, 23-38, 44; xxiv. 1-16, 23; xxv. 8-10, 13-16, 23-34, 39<sup>ab</sup>, 40<sup>b</sup>, 44-54 (except 46<sup>b</sup>); xxvii.

*Numbers.* i-x. 28 (except vi. 22-29<sup>a</sup>, viii. 23-26, x. 9-10<sup>a</sup>); xiii. 1-17<sup>a</sup>, 21, 25, 26<sup>a</sup>, 32; xiv. 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, 5-7, 10, 26-29 (except v. 28), 32-38; xv. 1-16, 22-36; xvi. 1a, 2<sup>b</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, 5-11, 16-24, 27<sup>a</sup>, 35; xvii-xix; xx. 2, 3<sup>b</sup>, 6, 8<sup>b</sup>-12 (except 10<sup>b</sup>), 22-29; xxi. 4, 10, 11; xxii. 1; xxv. 6-xxxi (except xxvi. 9-11, 65); xxxii. 2, 19, 24, 28-32<sup>a</sup>; xxxiii. 50, 51, 54; xxxiv-xxxvi.

*Deuteronomy.* xxxii. 48-51; xxxiv. 1-3, 4-6<sup>a</sup>, 7-9.

#### WELLHAUSEN:

*Genesis.* i. 1-ii. 4<sup>a</sup>; v (except v. 29); vi. 9-22; vii. 11-viii. 5, (except vii. 12, 16<sup>a</sup>, 17, 22, 23, viii. 2<sup>b</sup>); viii. 13-19; ix. 1-17, 28, 29; x. 1-5, 6, 7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32; xi. 10-26, 27-32 (except v. 29); xii. 4<sup>b</sup>, 5; xiii. 6, 11<sup>b</sup>, 12; xvi. 3, 15, 16; xvii. 1-27; xix. 29; xxi. 2<sup>b</sup>, 3-5; xxiii. 1-20; xxv. 7-11<sup>a</sup>, 12-17, 19, 20, 26<sup>a</sup>; xxvi. 34, 35; xxvii. 46; xxviii. 1-9 (xxix. 24, 28<sup>b</sup>, 29<sup>a</sup>); xxxi. 18; xxxv. 9-13, 15, 16<sup>a</sup>, 19, 22<sup>a</sup>-29; xxxvi. 6-8, 40-43 (1-5, 9-30 doubtful); xxxvii. 1, 2 partly; xlv. 6, 7, (8-27 recast); xlvii. 5<sup>b</sup>-33; i. 12, 13.

*Exodus.* i. 1-5, 13, 14; ii. 23-25; vi. 2-12, 13-28 recast; vii. 1-7, 8-13, 19, 20<sup>a</sup>, 21<sup>a</sup>, 22, 23; viii. 1-3, 11<sup>b</sup>, 12-15; ix. 8-12; xi. 9, 10; xii. 1-20, 28, 37<sup>a</sup> 40-51; xiii. 1, 2, 20; xiv. 1, 2; xvi. 1-3, 9-13<sup>a</sup>, 16<sup>b</sup>, 18, 22-26, 31-34, 35<sup>a</sup>; xvii. 1; xix. 1, 2<sup>a</sup>; xxiv. 14-18; xxv-xxxi; xxxiv. 29-35; xxxv-xl.

*Leviticus.* i-xxvii.

*Numbers.* i. 1-x. 10, 11-28; viii. 1-17<sup>a</sup>, 21, 25, 26, 32; xiv. 26-29, 34-36; xv; xvi. 1, 2 partly, 8-11, 16-22, 35; xvii-xix; xx. 1<sup>a</sup>, 2, 3<sup>b</sup>, 6, 22-29; xxi. 4, 10, 11; xxii. 1; xxv. 6 19; xxvi-xxxvi.

*Deuteronomy.* xxxii. 48-52; xxxiv. 1<sup>a</sup>, 8, 9.

But there are other questions, generally, indeed, of minor importance, on which these critics are of diverse opinion; as, for example, the relative age of the Second Elohist and the Jehovist—how much is to be ascribed to the one and how much to the other—whether they were combined into a whole before they were united with the other parts of the Pentateuch. These, in any event, are points of secondary consideration, since it is agreed that there is a near resemblance between the Second Elohist and the Jehovist both in thought and language, and that they both belong to the pre-Assyrian age.

One question in dispute, however, is fundamental. It is the

question as to the date of that document which is variously named the *Grundschrift*, the First Elohist, the Priests' Codex, the Annalistic Narrator, &c. Is this the earliest component part of the Pentateuch, or is it the latest? That is a point about which, at the present time, there rages a most violent controversy. It is a point the importance of which cannot well be exaggerated. For if we decide, in accordance with the school of Graf, that the ritual law is the latest product of the Old Testament development, it will be necessary to revise all our traditional ideas of the history and religion of Israel.

What is the state of the question to-day? It is not surprising that, when Graf published his hypothesis, the older critics, almost with one voice, pronounced against it. They had wrought out their lectures on Old Testament Introduction and Old Testament Theology on a widely different basis. The adoption of the new theory would compel them to set aside the work of a life-time, and reconstruct their systems *de novo*. Not a pleasant contemplation! No wonder they struggled against the unwelcome revolutionary ideas, and hardly gave them a patient hearing. Riehm, indeed, as we have already seen, reviewed Graf's *Historical Books of the Old Testament*; but he has not seen fit, for some reason or other, to take Wellhausen's *History of Israel* in hand, though the author challenges him to combat. He, like so many others, is evidently perplexed, and it would not be strange if Kuenen's prediction made in 1870 should yet be fulfilled, viz., that Riehm will ultimately adopt the new criticism.

Prof. Curtiss, an American theologian, and one of Delitzsch's scholars, in a meritorious work <sup>(1)</sup> which reflects much credit on American scholarship, has tested Graf's theory at a single but vital point. If the theory be correct, then before the Captivity the priesthood did not belong exclusively to the family of Aaron, but was common to the whole tribe of Levi, and the distinction

---

<sup>(1)</sup> *The Levitical Priests*, a contribution to the criticism of the Pentateuch, by Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr. Dr. phil. With a preface by Prof. Frantz Delitzsch, D. D. Edinburgh and Leipzig, 1877.

between priests and Levites with the Highpriest at their head, as found in the priestly legislation, had no existence before the time of Ezekiel who (Ezek. xlv. 9-16) deprives the Levites (that is, the idolatrous priests of the high places) of their priestly functions, and confines the right of the priesthood to "the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok" (that is, the priests of the Temple at Jerusalem). This is the view which Curtiss, writing from the standpoint of the Mosaic authorship, has subjected to a sharp criticism. He not only endeavors to meet the objections brought against the traditional theory, but he also points out numerous difficulties in the way of the new theory, in the successful clearing up of which his opponents will not find an altogether easy task.

This book was published the year before Wellhausen's *History of Israel*. Since then the new school of criticism has been gaining rapidly, and, at least in Germany and Holland, it is sweeping everything before it. On this account, Dillmann's *Commentary on Exodus and Leviticus*, issued in 1880, was eagerly awaited; but when it came, many were surprised and disappointed to find that he had not surrendered his old position.

Another veteran in the field of Old Testament science has found it necessary to express an unfavorable opinion of the latest critical theory. We refer to Delitzsch who has published twelve studies on Pentateuch criticism in the first volume (1880) of Luthardt's new Journal. His concessions, however, are remarkable.<sup>(1)</sup> He admits not only "that there are elements of truth in the new phase of Old Testament criticism," but also "that many, or, at least, four hands participated in the codification of the pentateuchal history and legislation." He admits that "the oldest constituent part of the Law is the Decalogue, and the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx-xxiii) the overture of which is the Decalogue." He admits "that the portion of the

<sup>(1)</sup> The reader is referred to an Article by Joseph Cook in the *Independent* for Sept. 15th, 1881, entitled *Delitzsch on the New Criticism of the Old Testament*, containing a series of propositions written in English and revised by Delitzsch himself, in which he gives a careful summary of his position.

Pentateuch which Wellhausen calls the *Priests' Codex* (that is, Leviticus, Ex. xxv-xxxi, xxxv-xl, Num. i-x, xv-xix and xxv-xxxvi) with a few passages excepted, is, as it now lies before us in the Old Testament, the youngest component part of the Pentateuch; that is, that it represents the youngest development of the Mosaic laws, and at the same time we may hold fast our conviction that in its chief portions this *Priests' Codex* codifies laws transmitted from the time of Moses." He admits that "the Mosaic legislation had its history and that the codification of its parts was executed successively"—yea, that the process extended over a thousand years.<sup>(1)</sup> Indeed, the one consideration with Delitzsch seems to be, to save the historic credibility of the Pentateuch. Grant this, and it matters little to what age you assign its several parts. "The cardinal question," he says, "on which everything turns, is this: Is the information which the *Priests' Codex* gives us concerning the time of Moses historical fiction, or tradition of actual fact? We hold it to be tradition of actual fact."

But while the older theologians of the present time, whose critical opinions have long been settled, generally reject Graf's theory, even after the strong presentation of it by Wellhausen, yet this is not true of all. Kamphausen, for instance, who is among the most celebrated Old Testament scholars of Germany, and who has labored long and well, in 1878 gave up as no longer tenable the view he had always maintained, that the First Elohist belongs to the early part of Solomon's reign, about 1000 years before Christ, and since then by further study, he has become more and more convinced that the First Elohist must be placed after the prophet Ezekiel. Still he does not doubt that at least part of the substance of the ritual law wrought up by this post-Exilic author was transmitted from a much earlier age.<sup>(2)</sup>

(<sup>1</sup>) This latter fact is not expressly stated in the propositions given by Cook, but it is in the articles in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, p. 620. f.

(<sup>2</sup>) See his review of Smend's work in the *Studien und Kritiken*, Erstes Heft, 1882.

It is, however, the younger generation of Biblical scholars, who have adopted the new theory and are now its most enthusiastic advocates. A large number, if not, indeed, the majority of them, have expressed their agreement with Wellhausen, whose work has given a most lively and much-needed impulse to Old Testament study. Among these we may name Smend, who is regarded as one of the most promising theologians, and whose *Commentary on Ezekiel*, lately issued, <sup>(1)</sup> is pronounced by so competent a critic as Kamphausen to be the very best we have.<sup>(2)</sup> When Smend began to write this book, it was with the hope of refuting Graf by finding sure indications that Ezekiel made use of the Priests' Codex in the three middle books of the Pentateuch. In this, as he tells us, he was disappointed. As he advanced with his work, the priority of Ezekiel to the priestly legislation grew more and more probable, until in his study of chs. xl. and xlviii. it became absolutely certain.

The new theory has found a place for itself even in so generally conservative a work as Herzog's *Real Encyclopædie*, second edition, in which Baudissin, especially in his article on *Worship in the High Places* <sup>(3)</sup> comes forward as its advocate. It is growing in popularity, not only in Germany and Holland, but England and Scotland as well. It is the theory set forth in such clear and popular style by Robertson Smith in his widely read book, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* <sup>(4)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> *Der Prophet Ezekiel* von Lic. Dr. Rudolf Smend, ausserord. Prof. der Theologie in Basel, 1880.

<sup>(2)</sup> His *Moses apud Prophetas*, 1875, and his essay in the *Studien und Kritiken*, viertes Heft, 1876, *Ueber die von den Propheten des achten Jahrhunderts vorausgesetzte Entwicklungsstufe der israelitischen Religion*, have justly won for him a high reputation. Another essay from his pen, *Ueber die Genesis des Judenthums*, will be found in Stade's new *Journal, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft*, Erstes Heft, 1882, pp. 94-151.

<sup>(3)</sup> *Höhendienst*, vol. vi.

<sup>(4)</sup> This book has been frequently reviewed, genererally, it must be confessed, with little knowledge of Biblical criticism on the part of the reviewers. The ablest critique from the traditional standpoint which has come to the writer's knowledge is that of Prof. Green in the *Presbyterian Review* for Jan., 1882. There is another which has many points worthy of consideration, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1882.

The question raised by Graf's criticism is the most important that Old Testament science to-day is called on to decide. We have not the space to give even the barest argument for and against. We simply remark that heretofore the discussion has been conducted mainly on the historical side. The question is, whether, granting the successive origin of the Pentateuch, the order of the constituent formations is, the Priests' Codex, then the Jehovist, and finally the Deuteronomist; or whether it is not rather, the Jehovist, then the Deuteronomist, and finally, the Priests' Codex. The aim, as against Graf, is to show that not only the Deuteronomist in the time of Josiah, but also the earlier prophets, as Amos and Hosea, in the eighth century, show an acquaintance with the history and legislation of the Priests' Codex, and the anti-Grafian critics have adduced a number of instances that have given much trouble to their opponents. On the other hand, it is contended in favor of Graf that, if we place the ritual law of the Priests' Codex first in the order of time, we get an irreconcilable contradiction to all that we otherwise know from the historical and prophetic books of the historical development of Israel. There are three stages of legislation, we are told: the Jehovistic Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx-xxiii), Deuteronomy, and the priestly law of the three middle books; and these, it is maintained, in this order and in no other, dovetail exactly into the three stages of the history as represented by Judges, Samuel, and Kings for the early period, the prophets from Amos to the Captivity for the second period, and the prophetic and historical books after the Captivity for the third period. The only answer to be made to this argument is that the ritual law, although existent, lay latent for a period of almost a thousand years.

Of late attention has been turned to the language of the so-called *Grundchrift* with a view of settling the date of that document. Curiously enough its language has hitherto been regarded as an example of the oldest and simplest in Hebrew literature. This was considered as almost a self-evident fact, and Riehm has

employed it as an argument against Graf.<sup>(1)</sup> He affirms that the antique coloring which the language of the Pentateuch displays in respect to grammar and lexicon, appears most prominent in those parts which belong to the *Grundschrift*. He admits, indeed, that many of its characteristic expressions are found in Ezekiel and the latest writings of the Old Testament, such as Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; but he would account for this partly by the familiarity of late authors with the language of the Pentateuch and partly by their intentional use of archaisms. The subject was taken up briefly and in an incidental way by Wellhausen, <sup>(2)</sup> who maintains, as the result of his observations made independently of the Pentateuch question, that, while the language of the Jehovist is closely allied to that of their pre-Exilic historical books, the language of the Priests' Codex is of an altogether heterogeneous character, and can be satisfactorily accounted for only by referring it to the age after Ezekiel.

Ryssel in his treatise *Concerning the Language of the Elohist*,<sup>(3)</sup> was the first to enter on a systematic discussion of the question. The two points he endeavors to settle are *first*, What are the characteristics of the language employed *after the Exile*, and *secondly*, Whether these characteristics are found in the Elohist. The conclusion he reaches is, that we must distinguish between the historical and the legislative parts of the Elohist, and that, while the former belong to an age when the influence of the Aramaic language was still unfelt, the latter contain so many Aramaisms and signs of late authorship that it is impossible to refer them to the time before the Exile.

A still more thorough treatment of the subject has just been given by Giesebrecht, <sup>(4)</sup> who had hoped to find in a *grammat.*

<sup>(1)</sup> *Studien und Kritiken*, 1872, pp. 287, 288.

<sup>(2)</sup> *Geschichte Israels*, vol. I. 397-403.

<sup>(3)</sup> *De Elohistæ Pentateuchici Sermones Commentatio historico-critica*. Lipsiæ, 1878.

<sup>(4)</sup> *Zur Hexateuch-kritik. Der Sprachgebrauch des hexateuchischen Elohisten*, von F. Giesebrecht, In *Stade's Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1881, pp. 177-276.



cal study of the Elohist or so-called *Grundschrift* arguments against Graf's Hypothesis, and with this end in view took Ryssel's book in hand. But he was disappointed and came out of the investigation convinced of the late authorship of the Elohist document. Giesebrecht puts the question in this way: since it is generally conceded that the Jehovist must be placed in the interval between the years 900 and 700, and the Deuteronomist not long before 621 when the Book of the Law was found in the Temple, is the Elohist to be assigned to the time after 620? More definitely—since the lower limit is the time of Ezra, does the language of the Elohist admit of, or forbid his assignment to the period between 620 and 450? For the purpose of answering this question, Giesebrecht gives a table with various columns, in the first of which he places the lexicon of the Elohist, excluding all words that are common to the different periods of Hebrew literature, and all mere technical terms, which could not be expected in all writers. Then in other columns he marks the number of times the Elohist words are found, 1. in writings before 700; 2. in writings between 700 and 600; 3. in Exilic writings; 4. in post-Exilic writings; and in a fifth column, he indicates the many Elohist words that are Aramaic. We regret that we have not the space to give at least a few of Giesebrecht's results. We can merely remark that if he is correct, the points of contact with the language of the Elohist, become more numerous continually, till we reach the age after the Exile.

The Pentateuch controversy is not yet settled. Perhaps it, never will be satisfactorily settled. The questions involved are difficult and often extremely complicated, demanding a high degree of Hebrew scholarship and a familiarity with almost the whole Old Testament. They are questions for scholars, not for the mass of the people, who, destitute of theological training and without a knowledge of the original Hebrew, are incapable of forming an independent judgment. Let them be discussed by such as are qualified for the task—discussed with reverence for the Bible, yet with all freedom in respect to traditional

opinions.\* If what the critics allege as facts are not facts, let it be shown; or if the inferences they deduce from acknowledged facts are not valid, let it be shown. That much certainly can be done; if not, historical science is an impossibility. That much is required; and in doing it, there is no need of calling harsh names—there is need only of calm, patient investigation.

In the meantime we may be well assured that, whatever the issue, the Pentateuch will come out of the conflict unharmed as part of the Word of God. Long-cherished theories may be modified or given up, for they are of human origin and growth. But the Bible is divine in a sense that can be predicted of no other book, and whatever conclusions may be reached as to the authorship and date of its several parts, its divine character will remain unaffected. In every age it has authenticated itself to the faith of the church as a book which, in a peculiar sense, has come from God; and it will continue to authenticate itself as such in all the ages to come.

---

ARTICLE V.—THE CHURCH A PERPETUAL NECESSITY.

---

I. E. G.

---

THE Church stands out as a prominent force in history. It is not difficult to see that her presence and influence produced a specific order of things, and that in this way a distinctive character was given to the growth of social economy. It is understood that the body of divine truth, stored up in the Holy Scriptures, is the ethical foundation and ruling genius of modern, social and political life. This fund of theological ethics is indeed the gift of God in a specific and peculiar sense; it is a divine revelation of supernatural origin and character. Yet it did not come as a spiritualistic abstraction, by temporary, spasmodic, or magical force. All along it was the power of God in history, and that in the most real sense. The course of events was made the occasion and medium of its growth

and power in the world. Men received it by inspiration, and gave it as the Word of God, but all this was done in historic accord with the circumstances of the times, and in the natural flow of the world's life.

It is easily seen, looking at the matter in this practical way, that the Bible is the historic product of the Church. The writers of the sacred volume, and authors of its inspired contents, lived and died in her bosom, and they were themselves the product of her religious life. It is true, the cardinal dogmas and tenets which they delivered were not their own creations. These always came to them as the direct and special gift of God, and hence these holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But the Word of God, as spoken by them, was left as a sacred treasure to the Church, which was made the bearer of it to the world, to make it effectual among the children of men as the power of God unto salvation.

Now looking at this fact in its broad historic Bible sense, no one can fail to see of what immense significance the Church was, in all the ages of biblical instruction and training, to the progress of mankind. On the one hand she was the organized medium through which God raised up an infallible standard of faith and practice, which should be a law for all generations. On the other hand she was the agent, the sacramental guardian, under specific divine guidance, of a religious and ethical culture which she had the commission to enforce as God's own scheme for the redemption of the people. Away back in the days of Noah and of Abraham, and even amid the sombre forebodings of Paradise lost, the first notes of the gospel were sounded. This primitive evangel was the key-note of an economy, which was destined to be the central force of history, and to control all its issues in the interest of its own aims. All the ancient Hebrew prophets were the exponents of this economy, of this divine plan of the world's redemption. Not one of them advanced a scheme of his own, as the outcome of his own private opinion or judgment. They all brought to view simply, as the

inspired servants of God, the various phases of the same great universal fact, as this was made to appear and centre in a personal world redeemer. This was the Old Testament idea from beginning to end. The Jewish Church has told this Messianic story throughout all the ages of her economy, and in this way she has done a work which, as a world historic agency, stands out in history as the royal force to which all contemporary forces must do obeisance. And indeed the courtesy due this central prophetic ecclesiastical mediatorship, on behalf of a world in ignorance and sin, is not confined to contemporary periods and nationalities. It passes like a wandering Jew, with hoary head but firm and elastic step, down through the lapse of time, and leaves the marks of its foot-prints as it goes; and whatever its name and breadth of dominion may be at any given stage of its progress, it is ever the power that must rule the world, and by which the world must be saved.

The New Testament dispensation did not come in abruptly. It was the completion, the necessary historical outcome, of the Old. All the prophecy and promise of the Old is fulfilled in the New. The Messianic idea of the Old was realized in the Christologic life and power of the New. In the fullness of time the personal Saviour came, just as it had been foretold, and now the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the law, which were a shadow of things to come, ceased to be a part of the sacred ritual. The worship of the sanctuary from henceforth was made to cluster around the glorified personality of the one Mediator, Jesus Christ. This was indeed the beginning of a new era, and of a vastly different dispensation. The rigid limits of the law, which was only for a time, were broken down, and the gates of the kingdom were thrown wide open to all that would obey the gospel call. Along with this enlargement of organization went a corresponding enlargement of internal growth and freedom. The tenets of the New economy were radical in a most positive sense. Had they been interpreted literally in the spirit of a carnal mind, they would have led to violence and the subversion of the existing order of things. Socially and politi-

cally the world would have been turned into chaos and confusion. But this was not the plan the Church pursued in the enforcement of her dogmas and discipline. She adopted a plan for the solution of the social world problem, which was in accord both with her own redemptive genius and design, and the stability of human affairs. She proclaimed to the world that in Christ Jesus there was neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free. She enacted laws of marriage, of divorce, and promulgated political and ethical maxims, which laid the axe at the root of all the heresies and abuses everywhere in force. In all this she proceeded, however, not on the principle of violent formal reconstruction, but upon that of personal and social regeneration. She conceived her mission to be a spiritual one, and not one of outward carnal force. But as she elevated the individual and spiritualized the popular mind, the growth of personal and social emancipation followed as a natural and necessary result.

Such is the work accomplished by the Church. The world could never have become what it now is, had it not been for ages under a most potent ecclesiastical training. But it is presumed by some that there is a limit to the necessity of such organized theological tutorship in the progress of humanity. They seem to think that the time will come, and is already drawing near, when it may be said that the work of the Church is done, and when the people will secure the benefit of her spiritual aid in some other way. In times gone by men were necessarily dependent, but we are coming to the better days of personal self-reliance and self-helpfulness, and therefore it may be supposed that we are getting rid of the old conditions of religious culture. If this mode of reasoning was a correct interpretation of the signs of the times, the Church would of course have to yield to the inevitable consequences of age, and we would have to look for an entirely new order of things; but the argument agrees neither with the facts as these are tangible on every hand, nor does it harmonize with the philosophy of history which allows no such radical breaches in the life-

forces of human progress. A vast deal has been done in spiritualizing and emancipating the ideas of men, but this involves the dissolution of the Church and her religious culture just as little as the evangelic dogmas of personal dignity and destiny abolished the social order of the times. It is plain that the progress began and carried forward under ecclesiastical discipline could not go on successfully, without the constant support of the power that gave it birth. From this self-evident fact, and from the divine promise, we may safely conclude that the time has not come, and will never come, when the gates of hades will prevail against the Church, and when the spiritual wants of the world will be met in some other way.

The great Powers of modern Christendom are the masters of international law, and they largely control even the internal affairs of the pagan world. Nevertheless the number of idol worshippers is immensely large, and entire continents are still under the sway of pagan ignorance and superstition. Then there are millions also who follow the teachings of the Koran, instead of those of the Bible. As long as these false systems continue in power, the unification of the race is out of the question. Material improvements are a powerful agency, in the hands of Christian nations, for securing the universal success of modern ideas; and the superior intelligence of Christendom is helping immensely in destroying the colossal forces of pagan idolatry. Yet these agencies, by themselves, cannot regenerate the degraded masses of the heathen world. They must be accompanied and backed up by the organized power of the Christian faith. This is the power, the creative energy, which has begotten and brought forth our better ideas and more humane manners. This is the holy mother which has nursed civilization, and has made society stand forth in the strength and beauty of a new created manhood. And until humanity is wholly lifted out of its present sinful condition, and is furnished with other than natural capacities, the presence and training of our historic spiritual mother cannot be dispensed

with. She must nurse, and she must warm a cold dying world into life still. And could this mundane state be surmounted and a paradisaic millennium be ushered in, the economy of grace would only become the economy of glory, and would continue still as a part of the life of the new world.

There have been one-sided and dangerous tendencies under the influence of Christian ideas. In the early ages there was a strong temper to make rigid contrasts between the Christian life and that of the world. Many thought it necessary to withdraw from secular life, to retire to deserts and wild solitudes; or to shut themselves up in cloisters, convents, or nunneries, in order to serve God effectually. The spirit of martyrdom also grew so wild and fanatic, in its contempt for the life that now is, and in its haste to reach the bliss of the life to come, that this, in connection with the ascetic and monastic tendencies of the times, threatened to depopulate regions of country, and to subvert the social institutions of entire communities. We are no longer in danger of these errors, since they have been overcome in the course of events. But the errors of our own day are no less blinding and ruinous. The tendency is now not to despise the world and its secular pursuits, and to withdraw from it, or to rush out of it by courting the violence of martyrdom, but to devote oneself with absorbing interest to its claims, and in the hot pursuit of earthly treasures and enjoyments, to leave out of view altogether the greater riches of the spiritual realm which lies beyond. Material progress and the development of natural resources are justly regarded as one of the chief glories of our progressive age, and it evidently comes in as one of the grand phases of the historical perfection of the race. But like all other developments and progress generally, this sort of advancement and public spirit must have its normal checks and limits. Materialism, in its absolute secular sense, without the live co-partnership of a faith firmly rooted in the spiritual verities of religious and ethical truth, is but a degrading idol which perverts and crushes the nobler aspirations of the soul. St. Paul, the apostle of freedom and masterly champion of



legitimate progress, knew how to reach the ends of human life by a proper combination of earthly instrumentalities and divine powers, and it is the province of the Church to follow him in the same mind in meeting the issues of the day. It is interesting to witness how the most intense spirit of progress was tempered and guided by a rational conservatism, in the theological culture of our era. The chief aim was to inspire both the individual and society with a proper sense of the dignity of manhood, and thus to overcome the errors, the abuses, the wrongs, the oppressions of the race. And as in this way the Church aided in making the world what it is, so her service will be needed in keeping it what it is, and in leading it to the goal of which the prophetic genius of the times is so loudly dreaming.

At the dawn of our era human slavery was not only universally tolerated, but it was honored by classic heathendom as a necessary and normal factor in social economy. Of course the Christian idea of human personality came into radical conflict with this false philosophical dogma, but the policy of the Church was such that the evil was gradually eradicated without violent disturbance of the social order. Freedom grew apace, and arbitrary power was checked and abolished, in obedience to the evangelic maxim that in Christ Jesus all are one and equal.

This also affected the relation of the sexes, the institution of marriage, the right of divorce, and other kindred matters. Some of these issues are fully and finally settled, and can never be reduced again to the dogmatic ethics of ancient philosophy; but others are yet open to discussion, and cannot yet be allowed to pass from under the religious care of the Church of Jesus Christ. The air is even now full of violence, which breaks the most sacred ties with barbarian haste; and the most refined and cultivated circles are yielding to tendencies, which are as degrading as they are false. Evidently the constant inspiration of religious faith, and the strong arm of ecclesiastical discipline and theological culture, are needed as much now as ever to keep the world from going into moral

decay. Hence the social domain does not only require the perpetual tutorship of the Church, but the broad field of private and public morality would soon be in chaos, if the hand of the spiritual Keeper of the vineyard was withdrawn.

It is true, the spirit of the times seems to draw closer and closer to the central ideal of the personal Redeemer, and there are a thousand avenues through which Christologic ideas can reach the mind. The press is an all-powerful agency in these days, and it can carry on the work of indoctrinating the popular mind, in the absence of what strictly belongs to organized sacramental mediation. But this goes on the assumption that the religious and moral life is purely an intellectual process. It ignores the fact that the emotional nature is one of the strongest and most positive elements in human character, and that it can never be ruled out of the moral and social codes of civilized life. Our sympathies must be warmed up by personal contact in the bosom of economic existence, and that is simply saying that the Church will be in perpetual demand to carry forward this benign work in the high sphere of religious life. Anything so deeply rooted in the human heart as religious convictions, especially when these are the product of Christologic culture, will not be left behind at any stage of intellectual progress, and will never fail to carry with them a proper organic form and mannerism, and that means practical religion with a cultus suited to its character as a cardinal factor in the historic life-current of a God-fearing people. Let no one suppose, therefore, be he friend or be he foe, that the press, or any other intellectual agency, can ever take the place of the sacramental host of God and conduct the world to its high destiny without the aid of ecclesiastical support. No; the gates of hades shall never prevail, in that way, against any economy of God's own appointment, either in the sphere of nature or of grace.

But even if the earthly career of man could be successfully passed through with the help simply of secular means, the grand problem of human destiny would still not be solved.

Will not man live though he die, and does he not need preparation for the life to come which he cannot have properly without specific aid? And is not the training, that fits him for the enjoyment of the celestial life, necessarily of a social and sacramental order? Reason ventures to suggest something of the k'nd, and the glimpses, which the Word of God allows us to catch of the worship of the Church triumphant, confirm the idea, that the Church militant is the school in which the saints must be educated for the worship of the heavenly temple. That worship is social. It is worship around the throne, addressed to Him who sitteth thereon. Sometimes it comes from a few who cry—"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty;" while others cast down their golden crowns and respond: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and praise." And we are told that sometimes the heavenly worshippers swell to such stupendous numbers, that their united voices are like the roaring of many waters, making the eternal arches of heaven ring with their melodious songs.

We are advancing no specific theory of sacramental grace. Simply the broad biblical ground is taken that there is a kingdom of God in the world distinct from the order of nature, and that the Church Catholic has been, is now, and forever shall be, the historic sacramental representative and realization of this kingdom among men. This ground is, however, not simply biblical in any objective mechanical sense, but it is philosophical and practical also, coming as it does in the character of human experience running through the ages. Civil life would fare badly were it deprived of its institutions of mental culture, but the attempt to remand the individual to the primitive state of primeval life would be no more absurd and ruinous, than would be the folly of trying to fit men for the duties of the life that now is and for the celestial engagements of the life to come, without the practical theologico-religious culture which God has given to our hands in the history of His Church. And it need not be claimed at all that this divine institution was sinless and infallible, at any stage of or throughout the

entire scope of her historical existence, by virtue of her divine character and mission. She was only the earthen vessel in which the spotless treasure of divine truth and grace was stored up, for the beneficent purpose of enriching and saving the world. Sin entered into her history, but she grappled with it in a manner radically different from that of the ancient philosophers. She did not fret about it as a mystery, neither the origin nor the design of which could be known; but she battled with it as a moral lapse, the removal of which was both possible and sure. Hence, in her darkest ages, she was the fountal source of popular reform and advancement such as heathendom, in all its classic splendor, could never be. Yes, in these very dark ages, she developed a public sense of morality and of beneficence, which was never approached by the outside world in any period of the world's history, and which will stand as a perpetual monument of her God-given evangel of righteousness and peace to the end of time.

But we are reminded that the progressive genius of the times is getting to be more and more Christo-centric in its temper and habits, and that, in proportion as it is drawing closer to the personality of the God-man in direct personal intercourse, it is breaking away from the antiquated restraints and stilts of forms and ordinances and governments. It is indeed to be feared that, if this is really the temper of the Christology of the times, it will be necessary to confront it with its own chosen ideal for the purpose of convicting it of its own serious error. In the person of the God-man we have two natures in hypostatic unity. Neither the one nor the other of the two is absorbed, or overwhelmed, or ignored. Each of them remained in full normal possession of all that belonged to it separately, although there was an organic unity for the high ends of the incarnation. One may be allowed to suggest, therefore, in view of this sinless divine human personality, that these kind of Christologic champions, who find themselves bound to get beyond the organized formal conditions of the Christian faith, have reason to suspect that they have gotten away from the

historical Christ and are following after some gnostic figment of their own bewildered brains in His stead. Besides, the example of Jesus, and the judgment of His followers in all ages, are against any such spiritualistic conception of the Christian life. Whenever we get a glimpse of the life of the Saviour, whether it be in His youth or the days of His public ministry, we always find Him in profound cheerful obedience to the demands of formal sacramental piety. And immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit, His disciples proceeded to organize in the same sacramental way. And in this organized sacramental form the religion of Jesus has come down to us, freighted with all the rich fruits of a world-saving process, not in the character of a gnostic abstraction but in that of a flesh and bone historic economy.

Some modern thinkers have thought proper to advance the theory that the Church would ultimately be absorbed by the State, which would then exercise the ecclesiastical functions as a mere police, but this notion does not seem to take root very readily in the popular mind. There is a growing anxiety everywhere to shake off the Erastian system, which has held sway for a long while in European state-craft; yet the attempt is nowhere made to reach this end by absorbing the Church, but by separating it from the State and allowing it to manage its own affairs. This movement may be regarded as the result of liberal ideas, chiming in fully with the progress of the times. It also opens the way to the Church for a more complete use of her specific functions, in full accord with the law of her own faith. The State systems have served a good purpose, and through them a status in religious and moral culture has been reached which has made our present freedom a possibility and success. Now, however, we are coming to such a pass that, by universal consent, the Church is to be left free from all secular interference in the dispensation of her spiritual concerns, and when she can go about her work in the plenary power of her divine commission without let or hindrance. All this indicates no abandonment of the old historic order of re-

ligious life. It promises rather a vast increase of ecclesiastical influence and power, of the true evangelic kind. All that is needed is, that there be a full measure of apostolic zeal and energy in conscious spiritual conjunction with the glorified head of the Church, to make the emancipated sacramental host of the Lord more potent than ever as a world conquering power. If there ever was a historical necessity for Church authority to put its foot on the necks of kings, that necessity is now happily left behind. And if the churches of sundry times and countries were compelled to place themselves under the protection and organic control of the civil powers, in order to escape from the crushing weight of a forced ecclesiastical centralization, that unfortunate alternative is now also passing away, and all may soon breathe the free air of heaven in the folds of a better unity. But in this grand episode of nineteenth century freedom and harmony, the Church remains mother and mistress still, and she will likely swing her theological shepherd's staff more vigorously than ever.

But it must not be left out of view that there are numerous and powerful forces in modern life, very much akin to the Church at least in fostering the spirit of public beneficence, and these may be admitted in the judgment of many as her lawful rival in the domain of Christian culture. Some of these claimants for ecclesiastical honors are however only beneficial, and do not rise to the broad level of Christian charity at all; while others, though charitable in their spirit and aim, lack the specific functions which must forever characterize the priestly community of God's covenant people. It is well that men and women band together for mutual support, and that they labor for the amelioration of human misery. Only let it be understood that no one can with impunity thrust himself in the place of an order, the functions and prerogatives of which he does not possess and cannot have by virtue simply of belonging to a different order, however honorable and generous this may be. All the beneficial and charity organizations outside of ecclesiastical connections taken together cannot take the place of the

Church, either as regards the prophetic function of religious training, or as it becomes the sacred office of priestly mediation. For no one holding to the scriptural dogma of the general priesthood of believers, will likely push this tenet so far as to break down all distinctions between the world and the Church, unless he be already fully in the meshes of rationalistic unbelief. While there is no cause for unholy rivalry, or mutual distrust, or angry persecution, in this matter, it must still be maintained that the Church, founded and sustained by the specific act of God Himself, is a divine institution in a sense in which no other institution can be such, and that her motherhood is therefore unique and perpetual to the spiritual interests of mankind. Only let it be fully realized, on the part of orthodox Christian people, that, because of their high calling in the sacramental family of Jesus Christ, they should consecrate themselves wholly to the work of making the Church more and more the actual historical expression of the divine ideal of her character and mission. Just as the people rise to this work, the Church will stand secure in the affections of a regenerated world, and the process of winning the natives will go bravely on.

There are rumors abroad that the Church is losing ground, and that her sanctuaries are no longer crowded as they were in former days. There may be some truth in this, especially when it is understood to have a local application. As a whole the old historic divine economy is still in full force, and is more apt to gain than to lose in popular favor. Temporary and local defections are not only possible; they may be necessary at times to meet the ends of history; but there can be no total and universal failure in a grand world historic power like that of the Church. If she is losing in influence and dominion at any time and in any place, it may be the result of her own falling away from the orthodox standards of her divine character and life. Biblical Christianity cannot live and prosper outside of its own proper sacramental or mystical atmosphere. The power that is in the Church, according to St. John, is



greater than that which is in the world, and for that very reason it must be made up of different elements. If there has been no positive denial of the faith by many in Israel, and a consequent coming down to the world's secular level, there may have still been a weakening of the old Christo-centric convictions which find their expression in the order of the creed. According to this apostolic norm, now so largely recognised as the genuine theological growth and standard of the Christian life and of biblical culture, Christianity is not a vague spiritualistic influence. Christ, in His sinless life and work, is not simply a model which must be patterned after by the use merely of unaided human powers. The Creed, as the expression of the consciousness of the Church in all ages, sets before us an economy over which Christ presides, in which He dwells by the Spirit, in which the saints live and grow, and in which and through which they receive forgiveness of sin and life eternal. If this biblical faith has been weakened or abandoned, then there must be a theological revival, to make the Church of the present and of the future once more the great power of God fully up to the demands of the times.

Yet a mere theological awakening will not answer, though it be squarely up to all the dogmas of the Creed. What is particularly wanted is a magnificent exhibition of ecclesiastical munificence, in pushing forward the benevolent enterprises of the day. The spirit of missions, in the most comprehensive sense, must be made to grow immensely. It must induce the Lord's servants to go out into the highways and hedges, and compel the masses to come to the King's marriage. By munificence, and by a godly energy, it must reach out to the four quarters of the earth and lay hold upon all the secular energies of the world, that these may be brought into the service of the Great Master. In this way, rather than by argument, or by mere objective intellectual or scholastic orthodoxy, will the Church triumph and make the masses her willing disciples. This is an age of stupendous movements. All the forces of heaven and earth are in motion. That there should be some

confusion, and some doubt and uncertainty, in the midst of this, is but to be expected. Yet let no one forget that the conflict of life-forces always brings order and peace. Hence foes would do well not to glory and triumph until the battle is over, and friends should be divinely wise enough to dismiss their fears and doubts as long as the Lord has not given warning of His withdrawal from the supremacy of human affairs.

"Go ye, therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world!"

Such is our Christo-centric chart and compass. If it means anything, it must be perpetual, evergrowing, ever-saving, Christ power in the world, through the mediation of His one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church. And if such is the plain meaning of the divine commission, then it is equally plain that the Church is a perpetual historical necessity in the history of mankind.

---

#### ART. VI.—CICERO AS A MORAL PHILOSOPHER.

BY REV. A. R. KREMER, A. M.

---

OF all the great men of the ancient heathen world there are none whose names are more familiar to people in general than that of Cicero. As an orator he was without a successful rival in Rome, and as such his name is coupled with that of the most renowned orator among the Greeks. Cicero and Demosthenes are two names that are inseparably joined together, like those of our own Clay and Webster, whom as orators especially it has been customary to compare with these their ancient prototypes. In regard to Cicero, I am asserting nothing new in saying, that he has always been one of the chief models of oratory, the space of nearly two thousand years, with all the

immense advances in knowledge of every kind, having failed to dim the lustre of his renown, or to shadow the excellence to which he attained in his art.

There may be some who without having learned his personal history, may have regarded Cicero as a man of extraordinary gifts in this one particular only. If so, they greatly mistake. His gifts and attainments were grandly liberal and extensive. It was Cicero, be it remembered, who perhaps *first* asserted the oft quoted proposition, that to be a true orator a man must be familiar with the whole field of knowledge. Of this doctrine he was himself one of the brightest illustrations. There are men—and always have been—of limited knowledge and “loose tongue,” who can talk glibly upon a few topics, and by the unthinking multitude may be regarded as orators of great power: but let them be tried; let them be weighed in the balances of science, and they will be found utterly wanting. Their efforts are the flashes of a moment, grand, it may be, as stage thunder—and as short lived. The words of a true orator live forever, because they embody principles that are immortal. Even if he speak on questions of the least important and local character, yet the principles involved are great, and are met and expounded with the same force of argument that he would employ in a matter on which hung the fate of nations. The stump eloquence of demagogues dies with its own expiring echo. A special pleader, whose only object is to gain his cause, whether good or bad, may be able to “bring down the house” for the time being, but both he and his words are soon forgotten. Not thus, however, with the orator, Marcus Tullius Cicero. The fuel that nourished the flame of his eloquence was the love of truth; truth itself; principles of right and duty; therefore his fires still burn, and his name lives. Of course, the literary forms of his orations were of the finest and best, as we know; and his elocution and action were doubtless unsurpassed; yet these without the golden substance would soon have gone the way of all such. Cicero lives, and will live, as an orator, because he was what every true orator has been, a philosopher.

In considering this prince of Roman orators as he appeared in the character of a *moral philosopher*, I shall confine myself chiefly to his moral work, *De Officiis*. This work does not, by any means, include all that he wrote on moral subjects, but it may be regarded as his fullest and clearest exposition in the department of moral science. There is perhaps no other Latin work that should be more highly prized by classical scholars. It is used in most colleges as a text-book, both in this country and in Europe. It is said that in many of the higher schools in Germany it serves the purpose of a text-book in moral philosophy—and not simply as a drill book in Latin parsing. That surely is a high testimonial to its great merits. A work on morals by a heathen installed as an instructor in a Christian community, in this enlightened age, is something to think about. There are some queer things taught in the land of metaphysics, it is true, but, as I understand, it is not the heterodox schools of Germany that employ this book for such purpose.

There was the best of reasons why Cicero in this work should set forth those principles of ethics that were approved by the most excellent men of his and former periods: they were to be a body of moral principles and precepts for the immediate and special benefit of his son. He was not pleading a doubtful cause before a legal tribunal; his fame as an orator was not at stake; and even if he had an eye to the favorable reception and scholarly criticism of his work, it is quite clear that paternal affection had most weight, and that therefore his honest purpose was, as a principal consideration, to write such things to his absent son as would tend to his improvement in every good quality and virtue. It might then be presumed that Cicero—especially if we consider his virtuous character and varied abilities—succeeded in producing a manual of ethical wisdom that is worthy of examination and study, and fit, perhaps, to place into the hands of Christian youth.

Can this judgment be sustained by the testimony of the work under consideration? If any should demand for proof a complete system of ethics, in this work, such as might be produced

by an orthodox Christian theologian, it can only be said, the demand cannot be met. Cicero was neither a Jewish prophet nor Christian apostle. He was a pagan. At the same time he was the central figure in the golden age of Roman culture and civilization, and he made the best use—so far as may be ascertained—of whatever light and means of information that he possessed. Yet, in judging of his moral teachings, it must be constantly remembered that he never heard the voice of God either from Sinai or from Zion. And surely, when we consider the comparative moral darkness in which he groped after truth, we can only wonder at whatever light he was somehow enabled to impart to the minds of men. We may well believe, that the God whom we know, and of whom he was ignorant, had his eye upon him, and girded him (as He did Cyrus) for the great mission which he so ably filled. And, with this book on moral duties before us, it is difficult to see why it should not have been thus. Many of the most important, indeed ruling principles of morality are to be found in the work. It abounds in just discriminations and distinctions in the discussions of questions of right and wrong, which are so manifestly correct, as viewed even from the highest Christian standpoint, that the question arises in our minds: Can it be that such a noble heathen was not taught of God? Certain it is, that all truth is from Him who is the Truth. It is He who from His throne sends forth the seven Spirits of God into *all* the earth (Rev. 5 : 6), and why should not such earnest men of the Gentiles share largely in that impartial gift of light to the world?

Cicero's son, Marcus, was at Athens pursuing his studies when these letters were addressed to him. They were evidently designed to form a systematic outline of social, political and moral ethics. They constitute three books, and it would seem as if the author intended the whole as a treatise for general use, especially as a text-book of moral instruction for Roman youth, as well as for the special benefit of his son. A true patriot like Cicero, and justly awarded the title of "Father of his Country," would naturally desire that first his own son, and

then all the rising generation of Romans, should become faithful and honored citizens of the Republic; and no better way to reach such end could present itself to the mind of the philosopher statesman than to prepare for the rising youth a treatise on moral duties and obligations, as these may appear in all human thought and action. We come now to

### *Cicero's Principle.*

It is remarkable that, first of all, after a brief chapter of greeting and general remarks to his son, this pagan philosopher lays down as the corner-stone of his ethical system the very principle that is now most generally regarded as fundamental in Christian morality. He refers (chap. 2), to certain schools—"disciplinæ"—of philosophy, "*quæ propositis bonorum et malorum finibus, officium omne pervertunt*,"—which pervert the whole idea of duty by making it dependent on the good or evil proposed as an end; and then briefly, and with great earnestness and evident conviction of the truth and fundamental importance of his principle, proceeds to antagonize whatever is opposed to it. "For," says he, "if any man will affirm that the supreme good is not necessarily related to virtue; if he measure it according to its commercial value to himself, and not according to its own intrinsic moral worth; if such a man be consistent with himself, and is not at times moved by the natural goodness of his disposition, he can neither cultivate friendship, justice nor liberality. In a word, it is not possible that a man can be brave who regards physical or mental suffering as the greatest evil: or temperate, who installs pleasure as the chief good." And then, a little farther on, he states his moral principle in a more positive form: "Therefore the conclusion is plain, that if these schools are consistent with themselves they have no ground on which to build a system of moral philosophy;" or, more literally rendered, in latter clause—"they can say nothing concerning duty." "Neither can any positive, enduring, or natural rules of duty

be established, except by those who regard virtue as desirable only, or chiefly, for its own sake."

Here we are brought face to face with the very root question of ethics: "On what depends the right or wrong of human conduct?"

A favorite answer with many, very easy and plausible, and seemingly conclusive, is—*Intention*. A good or a bad intention, it is averred, makes an action right or wrong. Because intention enters so largely into the question, it is therefore taken by many to be the ground-principle of all morality. A man may do wrong, yet if he thinks he is doing right he is not only excusable, but deserving of the same praise as if the action itself were right. But this may be true or not according to circumstances; true in particular cases, but not in all; therefore false as a general principle. As such it lacks completeness, and borders on the absurdity that a part is equal to the whole. It is not the *principium magnum* of Cicero, nor of those philosophers whom he followed as his masters, nor of the most profound Christian moralists.

But the theory of morals which our classic author directly assails, as already noticed, is that to which he refers where he lays down his own principle, namely, that virtue should be pursued for its own sake. It is here assumed that virtue is an objective good, a reality in the moral world; not a creature of circumstances, but the inmost essence itself of rational and moral existence. Circumstances cannot change its character, for it is in its nature unchangeable. It is of supernal origin, existing before man, and before moral disorder. "Before the ages of civilization, before all things as they now appear or have been in the world, even existing coeval with the Deity himself, is that principle which leads to right actions and to the avoidance of crime. Before the written law virtue was recognized as the offspring of Nature, and eternal as the Divine Mind." (Cic. De Legibus.) Man as he is flounders in the great disorder, rises and falls—but virtue holds her ground, and in the midst of the troubled sea of moral contradictions is



ever the same. It is the *Summum Bonum*; and moral duty is: To seek, cultivate and become identified with that supreme good, unconditionally.

Of course Epicureanism and all its related isms, reject any such doctrine as downright foolishness, all lovers of the sensuous present world, in all ages, joining in the murmur of dissent. Nay! Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Their whole moral code is the one law of expediency. Virtue—whatever that may be—must submit to its decree. Virtue has only relative value, and is desirable and good, so far as it contributes to what men call happiness. "Honesty is the best policy,"—in all respectable communities,—and they will be honest, therefore, so long as this article of their faith may serve their purpose. There is another form of this proverb, and more honestly expressed; those who think the one is in the Bible cannot be deceived in regard to the sentiment paraphrased thus: "Make money; honestly, if you can; but, whether honestly or dishonestly, make money." If there is such a thing as honor among thieves, then there is an honest way of expressing and illustrating at the same time the doctrine of expediency. The worst sentiments are often clothed (Satan-like) in fine garb. So, not a few writers on morals, some professedly Christian, have launched out, in attractive style, from this fatal standpoint of expediency. Even Archdeacon Paley, in his otherwise excellent work—"Moral and Political Philosophy"—treads dangerously near it. Unfortunately his theory, when divested of its fine drapery, appears quite too much like that whose beggar's rags so poorly conceal its nakedness.

Evidently, our grand old Roman had no patience with the philosophers and sophists, who trifled with the eternal principles of moral obligation. They appeared to him as empty-headed charlatans, who made foot-balls of virtue and her fair companions—like a certain ungodly set who, as St. Jude tells us, "turned the grace of God unto lasciviousness." The doctrine of expediency as a rule of moral conduct conflicts at every point with our philosopher's *honestum* as the *summum bonum*,

because, according to his ethical principle, this can never be set aside, not even for a moment, in order that a line of conduct may be pursued at variance with it, for the sake of some ulterior good. The doctrine of Cicero is, that the virtue which the universal human conscience recognizes as such has claims transcending all considerations of mere utility or happiness. "I would rather be right than president," was said by one whom Americans delight to speak of as the modern Cicero, and right well did he express the sentiment of his ancient prototype. Who cannot see, that with such a principle ruling in those who honestly aspire to eminence, their success must prove a blessing to mankind, and their defeat no bitter loss to themselves, seeing that what they regard as the chief good is still theirs? "Virtue crowns her followers;" and the man who would rather be right than president, needs no other coronet than that which virtue bestows. He is a prince among men, even if men refused him the bauble crown which *they* have the power to give. His reward for inflexible adherence to duty is above all political honors and emoluments. Whatever else that is desirable, he may not be able to secure, he is nevertheless in possession of the chief good, and that is enough.

Now this is not to be mistaken for the cold and passionless doctrine of extreme Stoicism. Cicero was an ardent admirer of that prince of Stoic philosophers, Zeno, and accepted much that was believed and taught by his sect, but he was also greatly attached to the principles of the Academics, and in fact acknowledged whatever he regarded as true in other systems. He was an eclectic in that truly liberal and independent sense which excludes the possible notion that he was a "double-minded man—unstable in all his ways" and beliefs. He was an earnest seeker after truth; therefore he was not dwarfed by piping shibboleths; he submitted to no procrustean bed, nor did he move in a narrow sectarian rut. He gathered spiritual nectar from every flower that contained the pure and the good. Stoical indifference to the trials and sorrows of life was no part of his moral creed; as witness his grief over the death of

his beloved daughter Tullia, upon whose grave he laid his tribute of undying affection, in his *De Consolatione*—a lost work. He was no fatalist (which even some Christians incline to be), as is clear from his masterly work, *De Fato*. Nor was he an Epicurean; though he did not reject whatever of truth there was even in that frivolous system. But, as the needle to the pole, so true he was to the ground principle of his philosophy: that virtue is the chief good, and should be practiced for its own sake. His creed rejected every article in other creeds that did not square with that.

It could easily be shown that Cicero, in this moral treatise—which has been truly styled “The heathen whole duty of man”—is substantially true throughout to the great principle laid down in the beginning. But it is not my purpose to review the work in detail, both on account of the space such an attempt would require, and because the work itself is at hand for any who take an interest in the subject. It is a matter of supreme account that Cicero’s fundamental principle in moral philosophy—which I have ventured to assert he has consistently maintained—is the very same which the most orthodox Christian writers and teachers regard as the only true one. The highest good is not freedom from the troubles, trials and pains incident to man’s earthly life: not mere happiness, therefore, but the moral virtue which embraces the eternal principles of right and duty, and to be governed by it under all possible circumstances. So firmly established was Cicero in this doctrine, that he declared it to be self-evident to any one who thinks truly and wisely. There was no place in his system of morals for the mean and selfish doctrine of expediency. He doubtless would have admitted as practically true, that “honesty is the best policy,” but he would have scorned to admit the aphorism as a principle of moral conduct, or even to use it as a remote argument in favor of pursuing what is virtuous. Had he seen some of our Sunday-school books that recommend honesty to the young on account of the positions of honor and wealth to which it leads, and had he heard the same uttered in solemn

periods from hundreds of pulpits in our day, he would probably have wondered as much at our Christian stupidity as we do at his pagan wisdom.

The excellence of Cicero's principle cannot be over-estimated. Had he lived in Christian times he would have been a very St. Paul in the Christian glorification of those real virtues which he so much admired even as a heathen. There is no little resemblance between these two distinguished men. And the resemblance consists in the similarity of principle which ruled the thinking and acting of both. This, in the Christian apostle, was, *duty unconditional*, therefore holiness, which is subjection of self to supreme law, and which necessarily implies faith, by which the beautiful and good is perceived, and which opens the golden gates of Love, the universal, all embracing virtue, the sum of *all* virtues, the very "bond of perfectness." Here is the ground for the true ethical principle, which (ground) had Cicero known as did the great apostle, he could have given his philosophy the finish, which it lacked only through ignorance of divinely revealed truth; toward which, however, he was unconsciously moving, and with which, in darkness, he was girded by the Lord. The moral philosophy of St. Paul is the same in principle with that of the great Pagan. The idea of the *summum bonum* is the same in both: not happiness, in the empirical and vulgar sense, but a condition that is better represented by the word *joy*, and which cannot (like happiness) be repressed by any amount of mere pain caused by persecution. Socrates, while waiting for the moment when he must yield up his life to the cruel demand of an unjust sentence, *rejoiced* that he was suffering as a *just* man. St. Peter expresses the same thought where he says: "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings"—the sufferings which result to the Christian through the antagonism of sin and holiness. So Paul, "Rejoice in the Lord *always*," and he illustrated the sentiment in his own life, as is well known. He rejoiced while under the heaviest persecution, because the moral virtue for which he suffered was by infinite degrees greater than the suffering. Nor

was such grand superiority to pain due to wise calculation on his part as to how much he could afford to suffer, in view of the compensation in store for the brave sacrifice and stoical endurance in the service of virtue. He found the elements of reward in the exercise of Christian virtue itself. He did not regard the Christian life as a miserable cross to be borne, and which could only be endured in view of the decree which makes that a condition of entering Paradise; but he regarded what he already possessed as the chief good, and differing in the present state from what it will be hereafter chiefly in this, that it is here in large measure obscured by ignorance and moral evil, and must labor in conflict with powerful and relentless enemies. How consonant with this sentiment is that on which rests the whole moral system of Cicero, that the chief good cannot be separated from virtue, which has moral merit *per se*, and which is its own exceeding great reward. The principle of Cicero is of essential importance, because it is the ethical principle of the Divine law, the very spirit and essence of it, and fully illustrated in the life and teachings of Christ and His apostles.

Far below this grand centre of morality does the evangelical pulpit often fall, and indirectly at least teaches false principles of ethics. Sinners are nervously exhorted to repent, *before it is too late*. They are solemnly told that an unconverted state might do for this world, but not for the next. We hear from some pulpits, that atheism will do very well to live by, but will not answer (no, indeed) to die by; and serious people, instead of being shocked, meekly accept the falsehood, as if it were truth taken literally from the Bible. It can easily be seen, that such notions themselves tend to atheism. If the chief reason why men should repent is, because they may not long have the opportunity—because life is uncertain—there is an end of moral virtue. If a religious life in this world would be a matter of no great concern, were it not that safety in the eternal future makes it necessary—then religion is but an arbitrary task or penance prescribed as a condition on which

eternal happiness will be granted. If the sentiment were true, that atheism might do very well for the present were it not for the "bad place" to which atheists and other sinners are in danger of going, then it would be hard to say on what moral principles the Divine government is based. A pious mother is lauded, "In memoriam," for teaching her children how to live, and then, what is pronounced better beyond conception, for teaching them how to die. As if holy living did not include everything the most pious mother could teach; or as if only the solemnity of death made such living important. What would our pagan philosopher say to such things? We know what he does say—and that, if he had opportunity, he would call the whole assembly of such Christians "weak brethren." On some main points Cicero is a better theologian than hundreds of Christians who patronizingly express their admiration of him. If he were to come to us now, he would tell us not to go after solving the mean and beggarly question: At how little expense of earthly comfort can I secure heaven, and still have plenty left for a good time in this world? He would tell us what he tried to teach his son: To love virtue for its own sake, and every attribute thereof; to seek to do right under all circumstances; to regard pain only as an incidental evil, but moral obliquity as an evil of the soul that should be antagonized as its worst enemy.

It is important to know whether Cicero practised the excellent rules of morality which he laid down. Testimony is strong in his favor. He is represented as a man of singular virtue by his many friends; and few of his detractors attempt to make out a severe case against him. Of course they mention the putting away of his wife; but it is well known that she was a woman of most violent temper, and taxed his patience beyond the line of endurance. In this respect Socrates did better; for he not only tolerated his stormy Xantippe—that pre-eminent type of feminine perverseness—but even praised her. But such men (and such wives) are rare. Had Cicero lived under the light of Christianity, we may imagine how differently

he would have acted. He never heard our Saviour's discourses on marriage. Much also has been said of his self esteem and vanity; but such weaknesses are not confined to Gentiles. Besides, at the risk of being thought singular, I venture the opinion that there is no special ground for this item in the bill of accusations against our philosopher. He has been called timid and vacillating as a civil ruler; and this judgment may be well founded; and yet, with all that, he several times saved his country from ruin. Perhaps his timidity was courage in disguise. He had faults; so had St. Peter and other saints—and our great Washington, his remote successor as Pater patriæ. His very faults were of such nature as to prove that he was not a cold calculator of means to secure personal ends. His patriotism was of the purest type, and his public life was free from the stain of political corruption.

His religious character has been doubted by some, but without good reason. Because in his *De Natura Deorum* he only gives the views of others, it is strangely hinted that he was an atheist. It might as well be said that the canonical book of Esther is the work of an atheist because the name of God does not appear in it. That Cicero was religious is evident from his frequent appeals to the "immortal gods," and the horror he expresses at the vices and irreligion of certain men. Consider the opening sentences of his first speech against Catiline. From religious motives he convened the senate in the temple of Jupiter Stator, because his beloved country was in danger, and he wished the august assembly to be in close communication with the divine guardians of the State. Think of Tom Paine or Ingersoll leading the way to a church for the purpose of deliberating, in the spécial Divine presence, for the imperilled interests of the nation! Such is not the manner of atheists. Then, what outbursts of indignation against the traitor for the wickedness of his private life! The Christian reader is amazed, and feels self-condemned when he is met by such singular zeal for virtue and piety coming from a heathen statesman. Indeed, he was the very man who could consistently write such a work—



*De Officiis*. In fact, scarcely a work of his that has come down to us but gives evidence of strong religious belief and character. A passage from *De Senectute* will show whether Cicero had any religious belief, or whether he shared the gloomy sentiment of atheism, that death is an eternal sleep :

"O illustrious day! when I shall set out to join that divine companionship and association of kindred spirits, and depart from this disturbed and polluted world forever! For I shall depart not only to those men of whom I have spoken before but also to my Cato, than whom was never a better man born, nor was there ever one more distinguished for piety. I burned his body (at his funeral), though it were more fit that mine should have been burned by him. But his spirit not deserting me, but looking back upon me as it fled, surely departed to those regions whither it perceived that I would also come. But while I seemed to bear my sorrow with fortitude, it was not borne without inward pain; and yet I always console myself in the reflection, that the barriers of time and distance between us shall ere long be removed."

Let this now suffice for the man and his works. As it is the heart (rather than the intellect) that makes a good theologian, the same is true of the moral philosopher. Cicero was a living illustration of the truths he taught. His heart is in his moral works; and that is why they have life. A base character might be able to deal with virtue, in a formal way, on paper; but counterfeits, however well executed, are soon revealed as worthless; so the moral teachings of men, in order to live and impart life, must be indited by a pure heart guided by a well disciplined mind.

Therefore the works of Cicero have been very properly accorded a prominent part in classical instruction. There may be just ground for objection to some at least of the Latin and Greek classics that are usually admitted into colleges. To cite but one very popular author, Herodotus, it may be truly said that the indiscriminate use of his great historical work in our schools can scarcely be wholesome. The late Dr. Johnson, a

president of Dickinson College, did a good work, therefore, in editing and publishing an edition of Herodotus leaving out everything that would tend to corrupt the minds and blunt the moral sensibilities of youth. And perhaps it would be well if there were more expurgated classics which are used in our schools of learning. But there can be no reasonable doubt that the works of Cicero, if diligently read and studied, must be attended with no little intellectual and moral benefit. And among them all the noblest and best, it seems to me, is the *Offices*. Such a voice from the heathen world could not fail to produce a salutary effect in the minds of either real or nominal Christian students.

It is true, the use of this work in our American institutions may not generally amount to much. And for the simple reason that even in the higher classes in many, perhaps most, colleges the classics are used for purposes of grammatical exercise and drill, and not as containing anything worth knowing. A few questions and answers on the construction of sentences and other grammatical points, and the "lesson" is said, without the least interest having been excited by the instructor in the author and his work. The student goes to his task like a whipped truant, and is glad when it is over. Let the text-book be the *Offices*—little or no earnest is made of the subject matter by either teacher or pupil, as is evident not only from the dry-as-dust proceeding in the class-room, but also from the fact, that after about one-third of the work is *parsed* (not *read* in anything like a live way), it being gravely supposed that students should know the different styles of as many authors as possible, another classic succeeds, to be treated in like manner as the rest; and so on to the end. A dozen Latin authors, and as many Greek, are thus used during an under-graduate course, and in quite too many cases treated ever afterward as old lumber, without having left on the mind any clear and cherished ideas.

This error should be corrected. Better would it be, as I verily believe, for classical learning, if each classic that is read

at college were thoroughly mastered before another is attempted, even if but three or four, instead of a dozen works, be read during the course. Among these the *Offices* should be one. Would it not be well, in regard to this one classic, after the professor of languages has done with it, to have it entered as a text-book in moral philosophy? In the hands of the head of that department, if he be the right man for the place, it will become instinct with new life, its propositions and arguments clothed in new forms, all its gems of truth sparkling like dew-drops in the sun of heavenly truth, and the whole work, the product of a mind guided by nature and a good conscience, cleansed of what pagan errors it contains, and joined to that philosophy whose source is Divine revelation, and which is the ever obedient and faithful hand-maid of Christ and his Church.

---

ART. VII.—THE WAY OF LIFE.

---

*A Baccalaureate Sermon spoken to the Graduating Class in Franklin and Marshall College, in the College Chapel, by the President of the Institution, June 11th, 1882.*

*Text, Psalm xxxvii: 5. "Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him: and He shall bring it to pass."*

---

THE natural universe in every part and in every element is governed by immutable laws which determine with infallible precision the nature and end of every created existence. According to these immutable laws the innumerable suns and planets that illumine immensity of space roll their everlasting round, "forever singing as they shine, the hand that made them is divine." On our earth, from the rudest forms of inorganic matter up through all the rising gradations of nature existence in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, everything is determined by the law implanted in it by the infinite wisdom of the great Creator.

Above the order of nature we are confronted with a realm of rational and moral existence, which is governed no less by immutable, eternal, laws, but which comprehends the new and

wondrous element of created will, which possesses that power of self-determination which is the necessary condition of moral freedom. There are adumbrations of this new power in the internal self-moving and self-determining principle of life in the plant, and in the still higher power of choice between different possibilities in the animal, but it is not until we reach the sphere of humanity that we are met by the power of will in its true and proper sense. Here it is that we first reach the sphere of history proper, as a movement of humanity as a whole, advancing through progressive stages towards its goal, and here also we have before us personal human life, which carries in it an eternal destiny for every individual of the human race.

In this grand movement of history every human being born into the world becomes, in the unfolding of his life, an intelligent, self-determining factor, and upon the character of his rational self-determination within the sphere of universal reason and will, depends his success or failure here and his destiny in the eternity of existence beyond.

This brings under consideration at once the nature of this principle of self-determination in every man, and its relation to the moral laws of the universe as they assert themselves in human history, in the bosom of which every human life is unfolded. This principle of self-determination holds in the union of reason and will which constitutes human personality.

There is *a way in life* for every man which his rational nature must discover and his will must determine to pursue. This way may be true or false, right or wrong, according as the individual reason unfolds in harmony with universal reason, and individual will determines itself in accordance with universal will, or the moral law, whose inspiring soul is infinite love. But this universal reason and will, which we may designate as divine wisdom and divine goodness, confront us through the order and constitution of human history and the unfolding powers and capacities of our individual being. Every individual life develops in the bosom of the generic life of humanity, as this

asserts itself in the social economy, in the family, the state, and the church. In the social economy in its various divinely constituted forms, and in every individual life, there is the presence of the reason and will of God as the spiritual light and power by which men are to reach their true destiny. Through these, divine truth and moral law, God exercises His government of the world, and with these, every man's way in life, in order to be true and right, must be in harmony.

This divine government of the world, which extends in the necessity of the case to every individual life, constitutes what we understand by *divine providence*. This brings us to our first point in expounding the words of Holy Scripture which we have selected as our text on this occasion.

I. The true and right way in life for every man is that which is indicated by the orderings of divine providence.

God rules in history, and its ultimate goal He holds in His hands. Though it may be understood and expressed in different terms, yet this is a universal belief of men. He who feeds the fowls of the air, and clothes the lilies of the field so that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them, must surely exercise care and control over the history of the world and the life and destiny of every man. Yet it is equally true that history is free in all its grand movements, and every man, in a certain sense, wills and determines his own destiny. Man is a free agent, otherwise he could not be morally responsible. His deepest consciousness testifies to the fact of his responsibility. Yet over and above the free determination of the human will, whether active in the individual or in an associated capacity, the divine government directs and controls the end and conclusion towards which all is continually tending.

The providence of God is a mystery which our reason cannot fully fathom. It is a mystery, because the purposes of God are hidden from our knowledge in the spiritual world and are therefore not open to our observation, and also because they have their end not merely nor mainly in man's temporal, but in his spiritual and eternal welfare. That His purposes are

good we all acknowledge, but when men undertake to understand and interpret them with reference to mere earthly good they are often involved in difficulty. We cannot fathom the mystery of divine providence.

But this mystery though not comprehended by reason, may be received by faith, because while it is above reason it is not contrary to reason. The difficulty often raised here is in attempting to reconcile the divine government of the world with man's free agency. If God's providence reaches not only to the affairs of the world in a general way, but to all the interests and events of life in particular, it is difficult to reconcile this control with man's free self-determination. There is a tendency in the human mind to hold, either that all events are so ordered by the divine will that man's freedom is only an appearance and not a reality, or that man's will is the only controlling factor and the divine a mere nullity. Both these extremes are false. The one holds to a determinism that leads inevitably to a blind fate, the other leaves the destiny of the world and of individual lives to mere chance.

The true view lies between these two, and holds that the divine will rules in all the courses of history and in all the events of human life, and yet that the will of man is free in choosing his own course and destiny. What if we cannot solve the problem as to the relation of these two factors? There are mysteries in the order of nature which we cannot understand, and which yet we accept without doubt. Why may we not do the same in regard to this great mystery, especially when our deepest consciousness affirms its truth?

The difficulty may perhaps be lessened if we start with the view that the divine government of the world includes in it and under it the numerous possibilities that lie in the way of human freedom. These possibilities make room for opposition to the divine will on the part of man, but over and above this opposition the infinite wisdom and love of God are constantly directing the issue and end of all things. Man's acts are free, and yet, as soon as performed they fall, in their influence and

effect, within a moral government which overrules and controls them as to the ultimate end. An assassin may in the exercise of his will strike down a president. The act is a diabolical act, against the law of God, and entirely without his sanction or design, but as His infinite prescience included even this possibility within its scope, the fall of a president is not outside His providence, and may be overruled for good to the subject whose life is tragically ended, and to the nation. Might it have been otherwise? We must answer yes, and yet that same infinite wisdom would have been able to bring about His own ends and purposes in another way.

Our conclusion, then, is that God's ultimate designs and purposes will be accomplished no matter what attitude individuals or nations assume in relation to them. But in this process it is a question of success or failure, victory or defeat, life or death as to what attitude each one adopts for himself in life.

We now may understand the first lesson of the text, "commit thy way unto the Lord." In the work and struggle of life commit your way to the orderings of divine providence so far as these become plain before your pathway. In the choice of a profession or calling in life, for example, there are indications both internal and external which must determine what that choice shall be. Internal qualifications, bent of mind, persuasion, etc., acting under the direction of the divine Spirit, and external call and demand for the particular work the individual proposes to perform, these are the indications as to the choice to be made. Such a choice must in the nature of the case exclude arbitrary self-will, and the principle of selfishness which looks only to self-aggrandizement and earthly promotion. Just here lies the issue at the outset, and also at every step in life. Shall my own will determine my pathway in life, with reference to mere personal ends, or shall I submit my will to a higher will which guides and directs all for a more glorious purpose and end? Ultimately, victory or defeat, life or death, depends on the decision of this great question.

The possibility lies before every one to make self and selfish



considerations the pivot on which his life shall turn. Ignoring any higher will or law, he may determine to embark in the great struggle with the view to secure his own personal advancement and gratify his own selfish ends. There is a mighty power in the human will when directed perseveringly to such selfish end. It may succeed in amassing wealth, it may ride on the popular wave to place and power, it may carve its way through war and bloodshed to a throne, but in the end it is and must be only ignominious failure. It is a life wasted in contending against the purposes and designs of God.

All along the stream of history lie the wrecks of nations and individuals that aimed to carry out a selfish policy, that sought to secure worldly power and glory, apart from the divine purpose and will. They flourished for a time and seemed to gain the end they sought for; but when their work was tried it was found wanting, and the divine government swept them aside, raised up others to take their place, and the stream of history and of human life flowed on as before. The Jewish nation was raised up for the special purpose of transmitting the true religion down to the time of the incarnation of our Lord, but when, having subserved this purpose, they sought in a selfish spirit their own aggrandizement apart from the purpose of the Almighty, they were overthrown in an awful destruction and scattered over the four quarters of the earth without a local habitation or a name, a monument for all time of their unbelief and folly. The great world-empire of Rome was raised up for a special purpose in the providence of God, to provide a universal theatre for the spread of Christianity throughout the earth, but when it turned its energies to minister to its own selfish ambition and power, and set itself against Christianity and persecuted it, God destroyed it with a signal overthrow, and called in other people to take and guide the history of the race. What is true of nations is also true of individuals. There are signal examples of men with great natural endowments who were raised up for great and good ends, but whose selfish pride and ambition aimed to make the highest and best

interests of their fellow-men contribute only to their own personal gratification, and they too were hurled from the summit of their grand ambition into sudden disaster and ruin.

The same thing is constantly occurring around us in the less conspicuous walks of life. Some move onward in their avocation under a sense of the law of providence that controls all things for a blessed end—they may serve in humble stations and remain comparatively unknown, but they are working out the true design of their lives and are victorious in the strife; while others are casting up their own way and seeking to carve out their own destiny irrespective of any divine will to which they should be in subjection.

The only example of a perfect life in this respect is that of our Lord Jesus Christ. He came into the world, we know, on a special mission and for a special work, but He set a perfect example for all men in His absolute surrender of His own will to the will of His heavenly Father. On one occasion, when urged by His friends to go up to the feast at Jerusalem for a selfish purpose, he replied, "My time is not yet, your time is always"—by which is meant, I do not choose my time and occasions from self-will, but only in subjection to the divine will. As men of the world your time is always, and ye choose it according to the dictates of your mere selfish interest.

The challenge may, indeed, here be made whether the indications of divine providence are so clear that every man may know them certainly in the choice of a calling in life, and in pursuing that calling to its goal. I reply, there are doubtless different possibilities before men that lie in the same general direction. One is pre-eminently the right one, and to choose that is the highest wisdom. But in their shortsightedness men may conscientiously choose another lying in the same general direction and having the same right end in view. So at every step in life there is one and only one perfectly right way for every man. He may choose another with the best will and intention. Such mistakes, when made through an error of judgment, using the best light he has, God overrules for good. Yet

even here, a mistake in choosing a calling, though made conscientiously, sometimes brings with it disaster and failure, and the individual in later years feels himself forced to go back and rectify the error. If the world were perfect, there would be a right place for every man, and a right man for every place. As the world is we do not expect such unerring certainty.

But the great matter here is that every one should acknowledge that there is such a thing as a divine government of the world, and a providence in every life from its beginning to its close, and that the only hope of true success lies in committing his way in this respect unto the Lord, and not in attempting to direct it by his own unaided wisdom and for his own selfish ends and purposes. What a vast problem lies before every human soul launched forth on the ocean of life! What vast interests are freighted for such a voyage! From the cradle to the grave the complex problem opens up new responsibilities, and new difficulties arise. Each human soul is a vast, boundless, spiritual empire in itself, reaching out through the training period of its earthly life into the endless possibilities beyond. How great the folly of any one undertaking to direct and govern this empire without guidance from the great source of truth and life!

There are many errors that arise in connection with this point to deceive men and lure them into forbidden paths. The prime error and evil we have referred to, viz., directing the life on the principle of selfishness. In an ethical point of view this is the essence of all sin. A life that lays itself out for self in this narrow sense will inevitably end in disappointment and failure. "Whosoever seeketh to save his life," in this sense, "will lose it," is the unqualified assertion of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. But there are errors akin to this which are not always so easily detected. Some men lay themselves out for the accumulation of wealth in a legitimate way, under the plea that wealth is power, and may be a power for great good. But it is not every man's calling to accumulate wealth, and he who turns aside from the path of duty and the calling

clearly pointed out by divine providence, in order to gather wealth, will most assuredly make shipwreck of his best prospects in life and his best hopes for eternity. And what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?

Again, a man may throw himself into the current of popular favor, and seek to control popular movements apart from the great principles of justice and truth. He may become a mere soulless politician and trickster, a time-server, under the delusion that he is serving the interests of the people, while he is only bartering away his sense of right and losing his faith in the divine government of the world. Napoleon became for a time the scourge of Europe and the cause of inexpressible misery to thousands and hundreds of thousands of happy homes, under the delusion that he was serving the glory of France, but it was his own heartless ambition that held him in thralldom. He flashed athwart the political horizon of Europe, like a meteor in the sky, but on the lonely island of the sea his life went out in darkness. How different his career and the results he left behind him from the career of our own beloved Washington, and the sacred reverence that clusters around his memory in after generations!

It requires faith thus to commit one's life unwaveringly to the orderings of divine providence,—faith in God and in the right. We have said that the providence of God towards each man has reference to his spiritual and eternal welfare. God designs and orders all things for the best good of each individual of the human family. This we may assume as a fundamental proposition. But as Jehovah led the children of Israel through the wilderness before they were prepared to enter the promised land, so each individual life must pass through the necessary discipline as its preparation for its ultimate destiny. The path of duty may not always be the path of external worldly success. Often it leads away from such promotion, and requires certain self-abnegation, which is not pleasant to the natural heart. Often it leads through persecution, often through

severe affliction. External favor and popularity are by no means evidence of true worthiness and integrity in the way and work of life. To go forward in the straight line of duty and of right, to work on for the good of others and the glory of God, in the face of such unjust opposition and misrepresentation, and under the burden often of trouble and affliction, that proves the true hero, whereas external success and prosperity are often the reward of the mere time-server.

What a lesson here for the times in which we live! Everywhere the bane of self-seeking is eating out the very heart of public virtue. Men scoff at the idea that any one should lay out his life on any other principle than that of getting the most and the best for himself. The idea of standing in the right for right's sake, of trusting in God for the vindication of the right and for true success, is regarded as an exploded superstition of bygone religious ages. "Providence helps those that help themselves," "*quisque suæ fortunæ faber*," these are the aphorisms which are used to rule divine providence and God's government out of the world, and to make each man's selfish interest the only arbiter of his life and destiny.

But it is all a mistake, a fatal mistake. "There is a providence that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we may." God does rule in the affairs of nations, in the ethical constitution of society, in the course of every individual life, whatever men may say or think. He only is strong in his integrity who merges his personal will in the divine will, and seeks to stand on a broader current of life than that of his own self-seeking. Such a man may have personal infirmities, and in his struggle to gain the mastery over himself may sometimes fail, but he repents of the wrong and gives evidence of his sincere purpose to recover himself. God forgives him, and man should not be less forgiving than God. But he who determines his life studiously, premeditatedly, with reference to his own self-interest, and without regard to the will and purpose of a higher directing and controlling power, he is the really weak and wicked man, and by such a course lays the foundation for ulti-

mate failure and disaster. Selfishness, in the form of self-seeking, is the fatal sin that blasts many a life where the exterior is all fair and flattering. Everything depends upon the underlying principle of a man's life. If that principle be a recognition of God's will and His orderings, and he commits himself by faith to these in a sincere and childlike spirit, there will arise light above His pathway, and there will be developed in him a strength which is more than human. Such an one, standing humbly in his place, it matters little whether it be exalted or lowly in the estimation of the world, and living day by day in conscious harmony with the will of God, cannot be shaken in his purpose and position. He builds his house upon the solid foundation of a rock, and when the storms of opposition and persecution come, it will stand, because it is under the favor and protection of the Almighty.

The opposite principle of self-seeking may make a show of strength, may seem to advance more rapidly towards success, may receive the favorable judgment of men, but it is like a house built upon the sand. It has no moorings in the eternal truth and right, and sooner or later its real weakness will appear.

Every right and honorable calling in life carries in it some sense, however imperfect and obscure, of this strengthening and elevating power, and becomes really a religious devotion. Men realize that it brings them into an order of life which is divinely appointed in the world's moral constitution, that through it, as a channel, there is an influx of spiritual influences and power which renders them liberal and strong, and thus it becomes for them a preparation for that higher life of man in which God comes in the power of His Holy Spirit to dwell in the heart and make His abode there.

And this leads us to the second truth included in the subject set forth in the text, viz.:

II. *The way of life requires a full surrender to the Word of God in the sphere of the new creation in Jesus Christ.*

What I have thus far urged in regard to the paramount claims of the divine will in the government of the world, and

in the ordering of every individual life, will be accepted by all who believe in a personal God who rules with absolute authority in the affairs of men. But when we advance to the proposition that there can be no right and true faith in divine providence except as that faith accepts the truth of Christianity and rests in its power to bring our life into proper relation to God and give it real success, we encounter new difficulties from the natural reason. What is the relation between the divine economy in the order of providence and God's revelation in Jesus Christ through His holy Word? Let us endeavor to answer this difficult question as best we may.

The Christian religion is regarded by some as a separate economy introduced to complement the natural economy of the world, and especially to provide for those interests of man that pertain merely to a future life. They regard it as a personal concern between each man and his Maker, in which, apart from his ordinary relations in the world he is to secure a state of happiness beyond his earthly life. In that way the two, the ethical and the religious spheres are held separate and apart and come to no real and true unity, and this is therefore manifestly a wrong conception of the relation between the two. The order of providence does not move on one plane and the order of grace on another. We are rather to conceive of the new creation inaugurated in the incarnation of the Son of God as entering into the inmost depths of the first creation in order to elevate this latter into its own sphere by infusing into it the glorified life of Christ.

The moral economy of the world is upheld by the presence and power of the divine law. As the natural creation would dissolve and perish if the upholding power of God were withdrawn from it for a single moment, so the ethical constitution of human society is constantly dependent for its existence on the moral law. As now the moral law revealed in the moral nature of man, in conscience and will, and in the social constitution of human society, in the family and the State, comes to its full and complete utterance in the law that was revealed on



Mt. Sinai, the ten commandments, so the ethical life of man comes to its completion in the life of Him who triumphed over the powers of death and hell, and introduced into the centre of our fallen humanity the principle of divine love, which is the fulfillment of the law. The revealed law of God comprehended in the ten commandments is not in conflict with that principle of right which was originally implanted in the human will and in the social economy, but it comes to intone this principle with new energy. And so this revealed law is regarded by all human codes in the Christian nations of the globe. It is accepted as supreme authority for all common law, and enters into all jurisprudence.

But the law requires as its soul and life the principle of love, so that it may not merely stand over man, but be written on the tablet of the heart, that man's obedience may become an obedience of love. This required the advent of the Word of God in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. His advent formed the grand epoch of human history, and His religion the moving power to regenerate the world. With Him came new spiritual health and life for the nations, and a light that, coming into the world, lighteneth every man. His propitiatory sacrifice on the cross removed the curse that hung over a guilty world, His resurrection brought life and immortality to light, and His glorification brought as its fruit the advent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost to bring home to the hearts and consciences of men the presence and power of the Word of God.

Christianity has thus entered as a new, life-giving, principle into history. God in Christ is now enthroned as the ruler of the world and its final Judge. "All power," we hear Him say before His ascension, "is given unto me in heaven and on earth." Christianity has become the ruling principle in modern history. Upon the ruins of heathen religions it has erected its temple for all the nations, and around it now cluster the brightest hopes and aspirations of the human race. The true pathway of the nations lies in following the light and guidance of Christianity. The nations that lie beyond its full orbéd radi-

ance are confessedly involved in moral darkness, and from the distant orient they are seeking for its light to guide them in the pathway of true safety and true prosperity.

The reason for this lies in the fact that the true meaning of history and the true destiny of the world are determined by their relation to a higher state of being than that of the present. As every thing in the order of the natural creation looks to man's rational and ethical life for its completion, and can be properly understood and interpreted only in the light of this end, so man's rational and ethical life looks to a union with a higher state of existence in the spiritual world for its completion.

There is, indeed, a relative end, which the social economy of the world is to subserve in elevating man to a state of civilization and culture, which looks to mere temporal well-being. Its object is to realize a well-ordered, happy life here on earth. And this, it is held by some, is the only end of the life of man as actualized in the state. But there are two points here to be considered. In the first place the state can never actualize even this earthly completion without the help of a higher power in Christianity to enable it to reach even its earthly destiny. The whole course of history has proved this. It is only since Christianity has entered the stream of history that man's temporal well-being has come to be properly understood, and especially has been able in any reasonable degree to actualize itself.

A mere cursory examination of ancient and modern civilization clearly reveals these two facts. Ancient civilization was ignorant of man's true earthly well-being. The destiny of the individual was absorbed in the state, and the well-being of the state was sought in the direction of worldly ambition. But the more it realized this dream, the more the condition of man became degraded—the more he became sunk in vice, and the more his whole life was overwhelmed in corruption. The life and power of the state had no power to bring relief.

But when Christianity entered as a new power into the ancient civilization, a new direction was given to the social life of the world. By its doctrine of the immortality of man, it

taught the world that human personality is not a mere instrument for the state, but must be respected and revered for what it is in itself. Christianity first taught the state that it exists for the good of the individual, and as this idea has worked its way into the course of history, it has wrought a complete revolution in the social life of the race. In modern times a different ideal is placed before the state, even in its purely earthly relations. Its true mission now is to legislate, not for itself, to enhance its own glory and the power of the few, but to devote its energies for the people, to care for the weak, the poor, the suffering, and thus to seek to elevate all the enjoyments and blessings of life.

It is through Christianity and the Christian Church that the doctrine of human equality has come to be acknowledged. Through these have come those eleemosinary institutions that look after the interests of the poor, the sick, the blind, the insane. These classes, in ancient times, were regarded as mere clogs and hindrances to the advancement of the glory of the state, and were cast out and destroyed. A Socrates and a Plato, in their philosophy, knew no pity for such. The spirit of Christianity has become inwoven in the very texture of modern society, and no man can properly understand its customs and its laws without knowing the principles of the life of Christ, and the precepts of His holy Word. Christianity has been as a sun in the heavens for modern history, and he is surely blind who does not recognize this new light that has come to direct and guide the earthly doctrines of the race.

But we have said that man's earthly estate can be properly understood only in the light of a higher destiny than that of this present world. The State is not ultimate for man's being. It acknowledges this when it recognizes and supports those institutions of religion whose special province it is to prepare man for a happier eternity. I know there is a theory that the State recognizes and supports religion only in so far as religion is a useful instrument in promoting the temporal welfare of society, and that it has nothing to do with a supernatural

destiny for man. Even this is an acknowledgment that belief in a supernatural destiny has a living vital power over man's present life. But the State goes farther than this. It confesses itself the overruling power of God, it appoints days of humiliation and prayer in times of national calamity, it confronts the witness on the stand with the light of the binding power of the oath in the appeal to God on the basis of His revealed Word, and it pronounces judgment on the criminal with the prayer that God may have mercy on his soul. It would, indeed, be a poor and weak sham for the State to recognize and use the Christian religion to promote its own earthly ends, if it did not believe in the reality of those eternal verities which it has revealed to man. And from all this it follows that no man can properly understand the inner meaning and working of history, of society, except in the light of that religion which has made for us a new beginning of the ages in the *Anno Domini*—the year of our Lord.

But it is especially in relation to the direction of every individual life, as such, that we may see the necessity for the guidance of the divine Word and Spirit, in order to direct aright *his way* in life.

Here especially every one needs a light for his pathway that shines not from nature or providence. These give no adequate response to the inquiry of the soul, "Lord, what wouldst Thou have me to do?" Above these forms of revelation, the Word of God, in the inspired Scriptures, carried to the heart and conscience by the Spirit of God, sheds a new, heavenly light upon his way in life. All true light for the human soul comes from above, from that spiritual and eternal world into which the present order of existence must merge itself, and in which its true destiny is to be reached. But the Word which was revealed in and through Him who, without presumption or vanity, called Himself the light of the world, is, in a pre-eminent sense, a light that shines forth directly from the heavenly world. That Word brings to light the real problem of every human life in its unfolding and progress towards an eternal

destiny. It reveals the struggle in every breast between light and darkness, truth and error, holiness and sin, and points out the way to a victorious solution. The contest that goes forward in the lives of men between the orderings of providence and the assertion of self-will is raised here from the twilight of revelation into its clear light of day, and becomes a struggle between the same self-will and the grace of God. The Spirit of the Lord strives with men. The Word of the Lord, which reveals the way of life, as a way that leads to a full personal surrender to the authority and guidance of Jesus Christ as man's rightful Lord, that leads to repentance for sin and faith in the pardoning love and mercy of God towards all who forsake and flee from it, that leads to the giving up of our own boasted wisdom and strength and following the higher wisdom of God and relying on His strength, that Word is for every soul the only true and safe guide in the great work and struggle of life. When the wisdom of man becomes involved in a labyrinth of human speculation, led on, it may be, by the greatest philosophers of the ages, then he may turn from the words of man to the Word of Him who spake as never man spake, and the dark problem of human destiny is made plain. When confronted by the difficulties that arise in every one's pathway through life, when overwhelmed by life's burdens, its afflictions, its sorrows, and ready to sink beneath the waves, the cry goes forth, "Lord save, or I perish," then the hand of the Helper is outstretched, and the danger is safely passed.

The great victory over self lies just here. So long as man trusts in his own strength he will not commit his way unto the Lord and trust in Him. Especially does our pride of knowledge raise barriers in the way of our looking to the Lord for the true wisdom that cometh from above. Only the mature experience of an earnest struggling soul that has sought for the truth as above all price and realized the emptiness and vanity of all merely human wisdom, could utter the prayer contained in those touching words familiar to you all—which we may adopt, each one, as our own with reference to Him who is the

true light of the world, as He speaks to us through His holy Word, by His gracious Spirit.

Lead, Kindly Light, amid th' encircling gloom,

Lead Thou me on :

The night is dark and I am far from home,

Lead Thou me on.

Keep Thou my feet ; I do not ask to see

The distant scene ; one step enough for me.

I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou

Shouldst lead me on ;

I loved to choose and see my path ; but now

Lead Thou me on.

I loved the garish day : and spite of fears,

Pride ruled my will ; remember not past years.

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still

Will lead me on

O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till

The night is gone,

And with the morn those angel faces smile,

Which I have loved long since and lost awhile.

*" Gentlemen of the Graduating Class :—*I have now endeavored in this last public service of your College course, in this sacred place, to present to you in the name of your Instructors some parting counsels that may be of service to you in the solemn juncture in life at which you have arrived. They embody the general spirit that has inspired all the instruction you have received during the last four years in these halls. We are conscious as teachers of much imperfection in the work we have done in your behalf ; but we have done for you what we could. Before His altar both you and we have bowed and confessed our manifold sins and besought pardon through the abounding mercy of that Father, who never turns away from the cry of His children, asking forgiveness through the atoning blood of His own dear Son. We shall not forget the courteous bearing, the kindly regard, the tender affection, you have manifested as a class, and as individuals, towards us and towards each other in the years that are gone, and as you now go forth

in the great work of life we bespeak a continuance of these towards the instructors you leave behind you, in the years that are to come. In a few days you will gather as a class in the presence of your friends and fellow-students to receive the Baccalaureate honors of your Alma Mater. One place will be vacant in that final reunion—of a beloved classmate—whom his parents and friends looked forward with fond hopes to see with you on that occasion. We extend to them our kindly sympathy in their loss, while we thus express, by this reference to him, our own regard for his memory. And now we commend you to the gracious keeping of Him whose good providence has brought you to His auspicious entrance upon the career that this day opens before you in life, and pray that His grace may guide you safely in the way of life and grant you at last a crown of rejoicing in His heavenly Kingdom! May His benediction rest upon you now and evermore! Amen."

---

-ART. VIII.—CHURCH DEBTS.

---

BY REV. GEO. H. JOHNSTON.

---

CHURCH edifices are a necessity. The general assembly above presupposes the particular congregation below, and the congregation must have its house in which to worship. Neither will God have it otherwise, else He would not have appointed a house to be erected for His worship, of which He was Himself the Architect, giving both the draft or plan and the specifications. The order for this first house of worship was for Israel a perpetual lesson of their need of a place of worship, and at the same time a law upon the manner of its construction, to be in full force throughout their generations. The chief builders were also specially endowed with the Spirit of God, that there might be no mistake nor inferior workmanship. The plan and the work were the best. The materials for the building were to be furnished by the voluntary offerings of the congregation. There was to be no compulsion in the



case. Neither was there to be any canvassing of the congregation by Moses, or by Aaron, or by the priests, or elders, or by any agent appointed for this purpose. Neither was there to be any special appeal made to induce Israel to furnish gifts and offerings. Proclamation was made that God directed that Israel should build Him a sanctuary in which He might dwell among them. That was all. And the offering that was made to this end was to be made by "*every man that giveth it willingly with his heart.*" Ex. 25: 2. The response was prompt and hearty. Materials of all kinds needed for the house were given and brought to the workmen. Moreover, the materials were of the best. Many also, including the women, labored with their hands in furnishing articles for the sanctuary. By and by report was made to Moses that there was enough, and more, with which to build the house, and Moses now made proclamation to this effect, and the contributors ceased bringing their offerings. Ex. 36: 5-7.

The materials in quantity were great, and in value the amount was very large. It is to be noted also, that Israel came out of slavery but recently, and hence was not flushed with wealth. Under the circumstances the whole-heartedness of their gifts was something remarkable, looked at even from our age. Thus the first house of God erected for His worship was built by voluntary offerings, and it was paid for before it was finished.

The churches built afterwards by the Hebrews were built by free-will offerings, and were free from debts. The same is true of the synagogues from the period of the captivity to the advent of Christ. The ancient Jews knew nothing of church debts.

Since the advent of Christianity the Jews have built many synagogues and houses for worship, but seldom left them unpaid for. Church debts among the Jews are found indeed, but they are almost entirely confined to modern times.

In the first ages of the Christian Church we know the disadvantages, persecutions, and poverty under which the

Christians labored. Their persecutors often robbed them of what property they had, hindered and oppressed them in their business relations, and caused them to flee for their lives. The Jews being very generally hostile to them, they did not inherit the synagogues for purposes of worship as often as ought to have been the case. Indeed, Christianity ought everywhere in the Roman Empire to have fallen heir to the synagogues as their legitimate inheritors. But, while the Christians worshiped in private houses often, and in the humblest buildings erected for religious worship, they incurred no debts, they mortgaged no churches. When the Roman Emperor in A. D. 325, became a Christian, and the persecutions, which, at intervals for three hundred years, had so sadly decimated the ranks of the saints, ceased, then began a new era in church building. Emperors and rulers in every country leavened by the Gospel, countenanced the building of churches, protected the Christians in their rights of person and property, and themselves built magnificent temples to the honor of Christ and for the glory of His name. But they paid for them. True, church and state were usually united in some form of dependence; but that sense of honor which counts the cost ere it proceeds to do a work, demanded that the churches should be paid for when finished. True religion came into the question at this point as well as on the side of worship. So much in the way of sketch touching ancient times.

Church debts, as far as the writer's knowledge goes, are very largely, if not almost entirely, a modern, and an American product. Europe knows little or nothing about them. It pays as it goes on this subject, unless the evil has crept in of late years. The same is true in the Establishment of England and Scotland. The non-conformists who proceed in church matters, as well in building churches, as in supporting the Gospel generally, upon the plan of free-will offerings, are in more danger of incurring church debts than the others. A less number contribute in the latter case, and they contribute far more in proportion than in the other system. But because the apparent

or conceived necessity calls for a church, an enterprise is often entered upon which involves more outlay than is forthcoming when the time is come to pay for it.

But the United States takes the first prize of the world on the subject of church debts. It is evidently entitled to it. There is not a denomination in the country which does not groan under this sorrow. It cannot be classed as an original, but it is without doubt one of the actual sins with which Christianity has to struggle in our day. In every state and county, and township, and in almost every village and town, and certainly in every city, the cry comes up, Who shall deliver us from the thralldom of this debt?

In a new country, such as this, the demand for church edifices is very great. The vast influx of population, and the intense religious activity abroad require the constant building of churches. Then the denominational competition is also a considerable element calling for the remodelling of old and the building of new and better ones. And the desire to occupy the same territory moves the several denominations (whose name here is legion), to build chapels and churches beyond their present ability to pay for them. Sometimes there are half a dozen churches in one town, with seating capacity to accommodate twice the population, and each one is anxious to outdo the rest, if possible, in the matter of its church building, and thus they not unfrequently build beyond their means, and then groan and languish, and some die under the burdens.

There can be no question but it is something very wonderful to note the vast number of churches built in this country during the present century. Not only is the number great, but the architectural beauty without, and often the tasteful finish within, call for the highest commendation. And when it is considered that the immense sums required for the building of all these churches is the outcome of voluntary enterprise, it is matter of gratitude to God as a testimony to His name, while it is at the same time an evidence of the presence of His grace. Such enterprise does not come of itself. It

must have adequate power behind it, out of which it must grow, and upon which it may rest.

As yet this country cannot stand beside the old world in the size and cost of its cathedrals, but that time may not be far in the future. If the present century is at all to be trusted in the way of prophecy, the day may come when Protestantism, especially if its larger branches should unite, of which there are longings and forebodings, pushing towards the surface, may rival in its structures the finest cathedrals of the old world. Who can tell? If several denominations, in the same cities, had thrown the moneys contributed for building churches into common treasuries, and built a few large churches on the same territory where they have erected a number of comparatively small ones, the amount contributed would probably be as large, and the buildings equal to many of the largest and best in Europe for a like population. Still some of these churches are both large and handsome.

But many of these fine churches are heavily mortgaged. While Protestantism and Romanism in this country may rejoice at the manifest spirit of religious enterprise abroad, which shows itself in the building of churches, schools, hospitals, homes for the aged and for the orphan, and in the work of home and foreign missions, at the same time the work has been, and is being damaged measurably, and often seriously hindered, by undertaking enterprises and giving obligations for their completion, of which there is no reasonable hope that the promises can be redeemed. It may be replied that we must walk by faith in building churches, as well as in the Christian life. But faith must be seasoned with common intelligence and judgment; for he is a foolish man who begins to build without first counting the cost.

Church debts are hindrances to the Gospel. They are secularizing. They crowd themselves in upon the thoughts and hearts of God's people. They cannot be set aside where they exist as if they had no existence. Like Banquo's ghost, they will not be kept down. Efforts may be made to ignore

them, to suppress them when they seek for recognition, and a steady purpose may be resolved upon to go forward just the same as if there was nothing of the sort where we worship. But it is vain. You might as well try (to use an expressive phrase here quite in point) to dam the Mississippi. The larger the river the more futile the undertaking. The larger the debt the more vain the attempt to smother the fact of its existence. It requires a large dam to stop a small stream, and by and by (it is only a question of time), even the small stream will so gather and pile up its strength as to foil all effort to keep it back. A debt may be small, but it grows. Like as the bit of snow on the sides of the Alps may start a ball that will cover a town at the base, so a debt may grow until the creditors will require the property to cover their claims.

Church debts are a thorn in the side of every pastor where they exist. The temporal and the spiritual are so related in every parish that ministers can be as little indifferent to the one as to the other. The spiritual house and the natural house are bound up together. If temporal debts are discharged, spiritual debts are easier of adjustment. If the church is mortgaged, the attention of the minister is divided, and he will find himself conning finances when he ought to be conning sermons. He cannot help it. The debt weighs upon the hearts of his best people, and the worse ones will talk wise things about it, and oftener unwise things, and the unpaid bills become a stumbling-block and a rock of offense to those within and to others without. And how can a minister go on in such circumstances with an air of indifference when it is constantly like a nightmare over his work? He lives in the heart of his congregation. He knows its inner life. He is conscious of its anxieties and of its indifference. He knows of its hopes and disappointments. He is aware of what the congregation regards its opportunities and the obstacles in its view to its larger success. He is student of human nature enough to know what a disheartening and hindering effect cramped and inadequate financial incomes have upon the man of business

as well as upon the Christian business man. He knows, too, that the spiritual life is sufficiently hindered by sin and its concomitants, apart from the constant demands made on the willing and the loyal by this cormorant of a church debt. Besides, being a constant hurt to the flock, and thus a source of concern to the pastor, he is aware, too, that it serves effectually to bar the door against many a one that otherwise might be accessible by his ministry.

Not only is the church debt a bar to the minister for proper and legitimate work within the congregation, the work of inner missions, but it is equally a bar to mission work generally. How shall Christians give and do for others, the destitute at home, and the heathen abroad, when they must constantly devise ways and means to meet the ever-recurring appetite of the church debt with its insatiable maw? And how, pray, shall the pastor ignore the full force of the commission under which he labors, and yet incur no responsibility, and commit no sin? There is the debt, and how shall it be thrust aside?

The consistory is charged with the oversight and care of the congregation, including temporal and spiritual affairs. It has the care and responsibility of all that is involved in congregational existence, work, and success. On the side of its eldership it is charged specially with the spiritual well-being of the members; on the side of the deacons it is specially related to the alms, the finances, and the property. Whatever belongs to these it is its special concern to attend to.

But what are the practical facts as they may be found in the large majority of congregations? The facts are substantially these. The consistory, including the pastor, elders, and deacons, are a board of finance, especially where there is a church debt. The first thing in every meeting is to overhaul the finances, to see how the treasury is: about the second thing in every meeting (where there is a church debt), is to discuss the subject backwards and forwards how to increase the revenue to meet current expenses, and how to pay the interest on the debt; and the third and last thing done is to sum up and adjourn.

There seems to be no help for a different course. The finances overshadow everything else. The consistory is a board of finance, and often little else besides. The temporal affairs crowd out the spiritual. How to regain the wayward, how to manage that the sick and poor may be visited by pastor and elders, how to secure regular attendance on religious duties, how to stir up the lukewarm to a better appreciation of their privileges, such and like questions, there seems little time to devote to. Not that minister and elders are indifferent to the spiritual needs of the congregation; but the debt with its history, so presses itself home continually that, *nolens volens*, they must grapple with it.

There is a time, or times, in the history of every congregation when finances must be prominent, and the consistory must lay hold on the work. Churches must be built, and rebuilt, improvements in the church property must be made, so that the saving of souls may be the better attended to. But such occasions ought not to extend over ten, or fifteen, or twenty years. When the work to be done is necessary or desirable, the ways and means for doing it must be canvassed, the cost counted, and then the improvement ought to lie fairly within the ability and the willingness of those interested to consummate it. In the case of missions, work must be undertaken at times when the means for paying for it are not at hand; but in all such cases the cost ought to be kept at the lowest figures, and then help being solicited at home and abroad, such churches and chapels as are actually needed will get sympathy and support enough to pay for them. Where there is no ability to secure money to pay for a house of worship, it may be taken as *prima facie* evidence that God does not need that church or chapel. His people can get on spiritually until the way is open to pay for a sanctuary in which to bring Him the incense of worship. True, the Saviour taught the disciples to pray, Forgive us our debts; but this petition were sadly perverted if it should be applied in the case of church debts, and yet it is most true that the hearty cry has



often gone up by burdened churches, O that this debt were forgiven us.

Perhaps one of the most serious and at the same time most baneful consequences growing out of a church debt is that it puts the congregation into a wrong position in the community. Its attitude will be an apologetic one. Gradually, if the debt is not paid in a reasonable time, the community will know it, and the congregation will know and feel that the community knows it. Every church ought to be strong morally, whatever may be the money value of its membership. Strength is buoyant, confident, aggressive. It does not think of apologies. The man that rises to speak, having something to say, will not spend time in apologies, unless he is inflated with vanity, or a fool. If one has nothing to say, it is wise to be silent. A church with a good round sum of a debt on it is timid and apologetic in tone; it does not wish to speak often about itself; it would rather be silent for the present and go on quietly doing the work it can do. But a considerable church debt is weakening in every view. It eats at the moral life as well as at the pocket. The pulpit once in a while on the Lord's Day says something about the debt. It is nearly always an unpleasant reminder. It grates. It stirs up thoughts more or less irksome to the worshiper. It hinders prayer, and song, and meditation.

It may be a necessary secularity, but it is a secularity anyhow, an unwelcome intruder, thrusting itself right into the midst of the worship. It is weakening. It makes the congregation feel that the debtor is servant to the lender. How can a congregation feel strong, and be aggressive under such circumstances? If its moral sense is blunted, if its piety is low, if it has no proper sense of duty and responsibility, then it may sit complacently under the load and look the community in the face with confidence. Otherwise it is doubtful whether it can.

Every church must be strong on its spiritual side if it would fulfil its mission. It must be untrammelled. It must look

the community in the face fairly and squarely with a confident eye. It must make no apologies. It must be under no necessity of making them. It must be aggressive. Christianity is the last interest that ought to stammer out apologies to the world. The Head of the Church challenged the Jew, and He challenged the Gentile also. He put Himself in no false relations to the world. He had a right to come among men, and when He came He had a mission to fulfil, and He fulfilled it. Every church has a mission, or ought to have. If it has, let it say so, and make the community perceive that it has. Early Christianity acted on the principle: put yourself into no false relation to the world. If in the first three centuries of the Christian era the Apostles and their co-laborers had proceeded on the policy of modern times and mortgaged three churches and chapels out of every four that were erected for divine worship, they would have put the whole interest of the Gospel at an immense disadvantage. The heathen would justly have called these Christians to account for attempting to establish their religion on the credit system, and so keeping the lender out of his money indefinitely, and not infrequently causing heavy losses all around. The heathen built their temples on the cash basis. They do so still. Christians could not do less in the first ages, neither did they think of doing less, and they ought to do no otherwise now.

Church debts may be accounted for in various ways. A congregation adopts a plan for a church, whose cost is beyond its present ability to pay for it. It expects to be able to pay for it in a year or two, or three, but its expectations are not realized.

Or, a congregation builds a church, for which it has reasonable prospects of paying when finished, or soon thereafter, but some unforeseen hindrance comes in the way.

Sometimes the work of building a church is undertaken, and subscriptions made are not paid, and promises of help are not fulfilled.

Whatever the cause may be, a church debt is an obstacle.

If the congregation has large means the debt may not hinder so seriously; but as soon as it is large, and the means limited, the weight of it is felt keenly.

Wherever there is a church debt it ought to be paid off. But, in the course of time, some of those who were responsible for its existence die, and some remove, and others who have come in since do not feel the responsibility of it as if they had had a voice in incurring the debt. Still, being identified now with the congregation, and sharing in its spiritual benefits, they also, along with those who were there from the first, become sharers in all duties and responsibilities, as well those of a temporal as those of a spiritual nature.

The congregation as such is responsible for its obligations, and as a congregation it ought to discharge them. But it is somewhat a strange fact that there is often a disposition to shift responsibility and to shirk duty at this point. Whatever relates to the welfare of the individual, relates to the welfare of the congregation; and as there can be no escape from individual faith and duty in the Christian life, so there can be no escape from a share in bearing the temporal responsibilities. Every Christian must repent, believe, pray, attend on the Lord's Supper; so every Christian is bound to contribute to the temporalities of the congregation, and there can be no moral discharge from the duty. One of the vices of the Christian profession in our day is precisely this one, that is, the effort to put upon a few what ought to be cheerfully shared by all. It is so too often in all church work, so far as the laity is concerned. In the Sunday-school a few do the work.

The church debts of our day could, for the most part, be paid by the congregations that incurred them, or that inherited them. There are some debts too large to be removed for the present, if, indeed, they can ever be paid by those responsible for them.

Wherever there is a debt, and it is not paid when it can be paid, there is a certain moral responsibility added to that already existing. For there is a certain moral responsibility

attaching to church debts, since they militate against the growth of the Christian life in the congregation where the debt exists, and since they are a rock of offense to some who stay away from the churches on this account. If a minister fails of discharging his duty he adds to his responsibility as a minister; if a congregation is derelict in meeting its obligations it increases its responsibility. Responsibility is moral, not carnal. But in our day there is a lack of appreciation of the moral responsibility involved where a church debt clogs the Christian life and work. Christians do not seem to think that the debt is to be regarded in this light at all. They look upon it just as they look upon any other debt. As long as they can worry along with it, manage to pay the interest, and so keep the creditors from pushing their claims, they are willing to go on, though it be at a poor dying rate. But why not rouse up and in good earnest lay hold on this enemy of the Gospel? Why not resolve to pay off the debt at once? Or, if it cannot at once be paid off, why not devise a plan of systematically reducing it until all is paid? Let the debt by all means be got rid of by paying it all, principal and interest. Then pastor and people can gird up their loins and devote themselves with steady zeal to the Master's specific work.

There is a feature in the modern pastorate in connection with the church debt malady that is injurious in its effect on the ministry, and hurtful to true piety. When churches have debts (and a very large proportion have them), the congregation is desirous in the circumstances to secure a minister who will be efficient, in various ways, in ridding the church of its burden, and at the same time in making full proof of his ministry in all other respects. He must be fresh and strong in the pulpit twice on the Lord's Day, and once in the week; he must be zealous in pastoral work; and he must excel in the sphere of finances. He must be well rounded in all such qualifications as will prove efficient in spiritual and temporal work in his charge. He is expected to fill his office well (which he ought to do), and to do work which his office does

not lay upon him, and which he cannot do without slighting his legitimate work. But if he does his own work, and much of that of the consistory besides, he is expected to preach as well and perform the duties of the pastorate as efficiently as if he were not doing double duty. Wherever this is the case the pastors are themselves measurably to blame, for they ought to limit themselves to their specific work, and expect those associated with them in the church to lay hold of whatever duties belong specially to their spheres of Christian labor. But they cannot always do as they ought, or as they wish, for if they did the result might be disastrous. Although it is reported of ministers that they are incompetent at business and bad financiers, we have no hesitation in pronouncing this judgment an error. Members of churches and officers who have more than once displayed ability to deal in financial affairs, have again and again resorted to ministers to devise ways and means to raise funds for building churches and for paying off debts. Indeed, as a class, they are better financiers in some directions than the laity, partly from necessity and partly from natural and cultivated ability. If a goodly number of the officers and members of churches generally, had no more of an income than the large majority of ministers have, who are yet expected to, and do make ends meet without discredit to themselves or their parishioners, these same officers and members would have to practice much sharper financiering than they do in their business. They would have to economize where now they are lavish enough. The fact is they would soon strike for a better income. If ministers and laymen could exchange places for a year on the subject of revenue and expenditures, there is little doubt but it would bring about something of a revolution on the subject of ministerial support.

But there is another evil growing out of the habit of building churches and not paying for them that were ludicrous enough if it did not involve such serious consequences. This evil is the one of raising money on false issues. Fairs, festivals, suppers, concerts, panoramas, etc., have fairly overrun

the church in our day. We are in favor of all proper fairs, festivals, etc., but it is a question whether this course of raising money for churches is not seriously damaging in its influence. Thus religion is reduced to the level of a frolic, and the money given is not in large part, given for Christ's cause, but for another purpose entirely. Christianity ought to be supported for its own sake, and churches ought to be built and paid for because they are necessary for the interests of the Gospel.

We are reminded of Pope Leo X., Indulgences, and the Reformation. The Pope wanted to raise money to build St. Peter's at Rome. He could not, so he thought, get the money for the object on a square basis, and so he resorted to a scheme that neither God nor man could or did sanction in order to fill his coffers. He proceeded on the principle: the end sanctifies the means; and so he sent Tetzels into Germany and Samson into Switzerland with stipulations in their hands to pardon sin at a price. The Spirit of Christ in the hearts of some of His people rebelled at this outrage attempted to be palmed off on them, and the Reformation of the Church began. It was well it did. The Reformation is a standing, historical, unanswerable rebuke to "Peter's chair," and church for practicing simony, which the Apostle Peter so scathingly rebuked in his day. The Roman church is in fact responsible for these excrescences on Protestantism for raising money by doubtful means. Protestantism ought not in this, as in other respects, to imitate the bad example.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

UNBELIEF IN THE 18TH CENTURY AS CONTRASTED WITH ITS EARLIER AND LATER HISTORY; Being the Cunningham Lectures for 1880. By JOHN CAIRNS, D. D., Principal and Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the United Presbyterian College. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1881.

This work furnishes an excellent hand-book to aid the student in threading the windings of unbelief in the 18th century. We say windings, for error never pursues a straight line, is never consistent with itself, and is steady only in one object—opposition to the truth. The author well says, "Almost nothing has been common but the rejection of the supernatural. Deism, pantheism, scepticism, atheism, all have appeared by turns. If there has been a progress, it has been from negation to negation more extreme; Hobbes leading on to Hume, Voltaire to Helvetius, Semler to Strauss. The assailants of Christianity have reversed each other's procedure, making each other's denials their premises. The most opposite views have been taken as to the validity of metaphysical principles, as to the authorship of sacred books, as to the meaning of Christianity, and the value of its separate parts. The most different modes of rejection have been exhibited, from superficial contempt to respectful, almost reverential, sadness. A whole generation, a whole century, disowns the spirit of its precursor, which, however, returns, if not in the mass, in solitary instances.

Yet there was progress, steady progress too, in this contest with rationalism. It is the province of truth to sift error to overcome it. The rationalism of the 18th century revealed antagonisms to the truth of revelation which had not been unmasked in previous ages, just because truth itself had made progress. Error always negates the truth, but the character of its negation depends upon the new advance of truth. The Reformation had brought in a new era for Christianity, an era, not only of opposition to the errors of Rome, but also of a higher stage of freedom. The casting off of the external authority of the Church, which had ruled over the minds and consciences of men in a tyrannical way during the middle ages, turned believers back upon the Word of God as their only in-



fallible guide. To a certain extent reason also had been set free in the pursuit of secular learning as it had not been before. The consequence was that a new battle had to be fought in the bosom of Protestantism itself in order that the new freedom might make good its title and stand firm. Hitherto those who made bold to attack the supernatural character of Christianity were at once put under the ban of the Church. They were imprisoned or put to death even, and thus freedom of inquiry was suppressed. Now this external restraint was thrown off, and the old adversaries of Christianity marched forth under new colors. Deism made its attack in England, skepticism and downright infidelity in France, and pantheistic philosophy in Germany. The deepest opposition asserted itself in Germany, and the most dangerous because it contained so many elements of truth. The assault culminated in Strauss and Bauer. They directed their opposition against not only the supernatural truths of Scripture, but especially against the divinity of Christ.

This attack led to new study of the sacred Scriptures, and this revealed new strength in its defence. Biblical criticism brought out a great deal that had hitherto been hidden. Attention was directed to the person of Christ as the foundation and support, as well as the source of Christianity, and Schleiermacher brought forward what has become a new central principle in theology. It was felt that the argument for Christianity based upon the prophecies and miracles, as addressed to the natural understanding was not sufficient. However true and proper in its place, yet it was not the deepest argument for the truth of revealed religion. All revelation centres in the person of our Lord, and the contest must centre here also.

Thus the struggle with Christianity developed new strength in the Church. It must be remarked that the victory has been gained, not merely, nor so much, in the mere strength of argument, as in the revival of genuine life in the Church itself. The strongest defense of Christianity always is the positive faith and piety of its adherents. The age of orthodox confessionalism passed into a new age of positive revival in the inner life of the Church. It came to be realized that Christianity is not mere doctrine, but life, the life of Christ in the soul. Thus out of the long and dreary strife, and out of the deep humiliations and sufferings through which Protestantism was called to pass it came out purified and strengthened.

From what has been said it must be apparent that Christianity never stands still, never remains at rest. It may be said,

indeed, that it is only error that is constantly in motion, ever changing its modes of attack, and that truth is ever one and the same. But it is the constant, steady advance of the positive that gives rise to the ceaseless unrest of the negative. Truth is life, and life is ever active. It has the principle of activity in itself, so that it would be a movement, a movement of the finite towards the infinite, of the creature towards the Creator, even if error did not rise to impede it. But as it involves on the part of man, in his salvation a movement from error and sin, and against error and sin, towards the final victory, it follows that one part of its calling and work is to sift and unmask error and sin to their lowest depths. Hence it occasions ever new contests. And these may be expected so long as any portion of the enemy's territory remains unsubdued.

The chapter on the opposition to Christianity in the 18th century is an introduction to the contest with unbelief in our 19th century. The war still goes on. Agnosticism, the unbelief and pride of human sciences, now raises its head boastfully against the higher celestial truth of revelation that carries in it a rebuke to human pride and human learning. Man must learn humility before the truth as it is in Christ can penetrate his being and raise him to higher planes of knowledge. But the issue is not uncertain. "Strong in our faith in Him whose name is the WORD OF GOD, and whose oracles outrun the light and discovery of all ages, and have already put so many predictions of failure to shame, the Church will go on to meet the ever expanding future with the undismayed assurance that it will but fulfill those "exceeding great and precious promises," which convey in their sublimity the evidence of their eternal truth and faithfulness; "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished."

This work of Dr. Cairns can be obtained for twenty cents. Why not get it?

CHILD'S HEIDELBERG CATECHISM FOR SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES.  
By E. V. Gerhart, D. D. First thousand. Philadelphia: Grant, Faires,  
& Rodgers, Prs., 54 N. Sixth St. 1882.

We heartily welcome the appearance of this little book—if book it may be called—for it is rather a primer in appearance than a

book. It is the Heidelberg Catechism simplified, by which is meant, not somebody's explanation of the catechism, but the very wording of the catechism itself given in short answers, adapted to the use of children. There are others of a similar kind which are worthy of commendation, and in recommending this we mean no undervaluing of those. We have commenced the use of this with two little boys in whom we are particularly interested, and we find it eminently suited to their wants. It will be a great help for religious instruction in families, and go very far, we believe, to aid parents in performing their duty towards their children, instead of entrusting this important work entirely to the Sunday School. It will be a great help also in S. School instruction. All the primary scholars ought to commit it to memory as a preparation to the catechism in its larger form. In this way it will prove a great help for the minister when he comes to teach these same scholars more fully in his catechetical class.

The work is not perfect. Here and there some may find perhaps some slight defect in the way the questions and answers are arranged; but all human productions are imperfect, and we think this little work will be found an honest and faithful simplification of our excellent catechism. It is timely, for the reason among others that it shows our attachment to the catechism. It has been hinted and intimated in certain quarters that some of us regard the catechism as antiquated, and even superseded by the more recent progress in theology. But this is a misrepresentation. It is confounding things that are different. Theology is progressive, especially in its form of organization, while the subject matter remains the same. In adopting the Christological standpoint it is coming more and more in harmony with the Heidelberg catechism, which is noted among the Reformation confessions for the central place it gives to the person of Christ. How different the Heidelberg Catechism is in this respect from the Shorter Catechism, or Luther's catechism! We have substantially the right stand point in our Catechism, if only we do not barter it away in our zeal to praise everything in other churches more than our own. This little book is a contribution to the maintenance of the peace movement in our church. It brings our children nearer to the catechism, and shows that we desire to stand fairly on that system of Christian faith.

Worthy of notice also is the brief introduction of Rev. A. Carl Whitmer giving a history of the formation of the Catechism. We are glad he conceived the idea of this catechism and had it so successfully carried out by calling in the assistance of Dr. Gerhart. The firm of Grant, Faires & Rodgers have done their part well, and we commend the work now to all our families and Sunday Schools. It deserves a wide circulation.